```
1
                IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 3
                          MARSHALL DIVISION
 4
   INTELLECTUAL VENTURES I LLC, ) (
 5
        PLAINTIFF
                                 ) ( CIVIL ACTION NO.
 6
   VS.
                                  ) ( 2:17-CV-577-JRG
 7
                                  ) ( MARSHALL, TEXAS
   T-MOBILE USA, INC., T-MOBILE ) (
 8
   US, INC., ERICSSON INC., AND ) (
10
   TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM
                                 ) (
11
   ERICSSON,
                                 ) ( FEBRUARY 4, 2019
12
                                 ) ( 9:16 A.M.
        DEFENDANTS
13
                      TRANSCRIPT OF JURY TRIAL
             BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE RODNEY GILSTRAP
14
15
                 UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE
   APPEARANCES:
16
17
   FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
                            Mr. T. John Ward, Jr.
                            Ms. Claire A. Henry
18
                            Ms. Andrea L. Fair
                            Mr. Wesley Hill
19
                            WARD, SMITH & HILL, PLLC
                            1507 Bill Owens Parkway
20
                            Longview, Texas 75604
   COURT REPORTER:
21
                            Ms. Shelly Holmes, CSR, TCRR
                            Official Reporter
22
                            United States District Court
                            Eastern District of Texas
23
                            Marshall Division
                            100 E. Houston Street
                            Marshall, Texas 75670
24
25
    (Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
   produced on a CAT system.)
```

1	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	Mr. Martin J. Black Mr. Kevin M. Flannery DECHERT LLP
3		Cira Centre 2929 Arch Street
4		Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
5		Mr. Joseph M. Abraham Mr. Timothy F. Dewberry
6		Mr. Joshua J. Yi Mr. Jacob R. Porter
7		DECHERT LLP 300 West Sixth Street
8		Suite 2010 Austin, Texas 78701
9		Ms. Nisha N. Patel Mr. Ryan T. Banks
10		DECHERT LLP 2440 W. El Camino Real
11		Suite 700 Mountain View, California 94040
12		nouncain view, outlionnia 51010
13	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:	Mr. Douglas M. Kubehl Mr. Jonathan B. Rubenstein
14		Mr. Jeffery S. Becker BAKER BOTTS LLP
15		2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, Texas 75201
16		Ms. Melissa R. Smith
17		GILLAM & SMITH LLP 303 South Washington Avenue
18		Marshall, Texas 75670
19		Mr. Asim M. Bhansali KWUN BHANSALI LAZARUS LLP
20		555 Montgomery Street Suite 750
21		San Francisco, California 94111
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise. (Jury panel in.) 3 THE COURT: Thank you. Be seated, please. 4 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for 5 being here. 6 7 My name is Rodney Gilstrap, and I am the resident United States District Judge here in the Marshall Division 8 of the Eastern District of Texas. I've lived in Marshall since 1981. I practiced 10 11 law in and around this area for 30 years before I got this 12 job. I came on the bench here in 2011. 13 And I will admit to you, I was not born in Texas. I was born in Florida, but as they say, I got here as fast 14 15 as I could. I came to Texas to go to college and then stayed and went to law school at Baylor University in Waco. 16 17 I am married, I have two grown children, and my 18 wife owns and operates a retail floral business here in Marshall. 19 20 Now, I tell you these things because, in a few 21 minutes, I'm going to ask each of you to tell me the same 22 kind of information about each of yourselves, and I think 23 that you're entitled to know as much about me as I'm about 24 to find out from each of you. 25 We are about to engage in the selection of a jury

```
in a civil case involving allegations of patent
infringement.

But before we go any further, I want to
```

But before we go any further, I want to briefly review with you how we came to have a jury trial system for civil disputes like this one.

If you go back in ancient history and you begin with the Pentateuch, the first five books in the Old Testament, you'll find that the ancient Jewish nation empaneled juries to decide issues of property ownership and property value.

Also in ancient history, you'll find that the Greeks began using a jury system about 1500 BC.

The ancient Romans, as they did with most things, adopted the jury system from the ancient Greeks, and it was the Romans that brought the jury system to what is today England when they conquered that island in the 4th Century AD.

So 800 years went by with the jury system being a part of everyday life in England until the 12th Century, and in the 12th Century, a tyrannical king came to the throne of Great Britain named King John, and one of the things

23 King John did was seek to limit and deny the right to trial by jury.

King John ended up in a series of disputes with

his nobles. It led to the verge of a civil war. That civil war was averted by a document that they all agreed to and signed at a place in England called Runnymede.

That document, which avoided that civil war and which restored the right to trial by jury in England is something you all probably have heard of before. It's called the Magna Carta.

As a matter of fact, ladies and gentlemen, 28 of the 50 United States have adopted in their own state constitutions the exact language regarding the preservation of the right to trial by jury from the Magna Carta in their own state constitutions.

So you can see from that history that when our Founding Fathers came to these shores as British colonists, they brought with them a longstanding and engrained reliance and familiarity with the right to trial by jury.

And the right to trial by jury flourished in the British colonies in North America for over a hundred years until another tyrannical king came to the throne of Great Britain. This time the king's name was King George, III. And King George, III, in addition to many other disputes with his colonists, our forefathers, also sought to deny the right to trial by jury.

And when Thomas Jefferson sat down to write the Declaration of Independence, which spells out with

particularity the reasons and the disputes which forced the colonies in this -- in this continent -- on this continent to separate from Great Britain and to form our own separate country, one of the specific reasons, one of the specific complaints set forth in the Declaration of Independence was King George, III's attempts to do away with and limit the right to trial by jury among the citizens here in America.

So the right to trial by jury is an important and a historically significant part of our heritage as Americans.

As a matter of fact, after we gained our independence from Great Britain, we subsequently adopted and passed into law, the Constitution, our supreme governing document.

And after the Constitution was adopted and ratified, shortly thereafter, the 10 first -- the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, a document we call the Bill of Rights, was adopted and ratified by the several little states to become a part of the Constitution.

If you look at the first 10 amendments to our Constitution, you will find therein the Seventh Amendment.

The Seventh Amendment guarantees the right to trial by jury in civil disputes like this one.

The Seventh Amendment, along with the other nine amendments that form the Bill of Rights, were ratified in

1 1791.

So for over -- well over 200 years, every American citizen has had a constitutionally guaranteed right under the Seventh Amendment to resolve their civil disputes through a trial by jury.

I always -- I always tell people that appear -- citizens like yourselves that appear for jury service, that in my own personal opinion, jury service is the second highest form of public service that any American can undertake.

In my personal opinion, the highest form of public service for any American are those young men and women that wear the uniform of our armed forces and put their lives on the line to protect us.

But by being here and presenting yourselves for jury duty today, in a very real way, ladies and gentlemen, you are doing your part to preserve, protect, and defend our constitutional right to a trial by jury.

Now, later in the process this morning, the lawyers for the parties are going to address those of you on the venire panel, and they're going to ask questions. I want you to understand the lawyers for neither side are going to be seeking to inquire unduly into your private affairs.

In other words, they're not attempting to be nosy

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
or to inject themselves into your personal business.
are asking questions that they are entitled to ask for the
purpose of securing a fair and an impartial jury to hear
the evidence -- excuse me -- to hear the evidence in this
case.
        Now, I don't know if it will happen today. It is
a rarity. It sometimes happens, but it's pretty rare.
        If any of you should be asked a question by any of
the lawyers in this case that you personally believe is too
private and too personal for you to answer in front of
everyone else, then you simply have the option to say: I'd
like to talk about that with Judge Gilstrap.
        And if that is your answer, then I will provide an
opportunity where you can answer that question outside of
the presence of everyone else on the panel.
        Again, ladies and gentlemen, that doesn't come up
often, but if it does, I want you to know that you do have
that option.
        The important thing this morning is that each of
you should give, full, complete, and truthful answers to
the questions that are asked. Remember, there are no wrong
answers, as long as the answers you give are full,
complete, and truthful.
        Now, the trial of this case will begin today after
```

the jury is selected, and I anticipate it will go

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
throughout the remainder of this week. I'm hopeful that we
can complete the case on Friday of this week.
        I need to know at this point if there are any of
you on the panel that, if you were selected to serve on the
jury, would have difficulty being able to be present for
the entirety of this week.
        And by that, I mean, if any of you have prepaid
nonrefundable airline tickets someplace, if you have a
surgical procedure scheduled for you or an immediate loved
one who depends on you, if you have a serious and a
compelling reason why you couldn't be here, if selected to
serve during this week, then that's something I need to
know about.
        Let me ask if there is anyone on the panel that
has such a scheduling issue, if so, would you raise your
hands and let me make a note of it. And if you'll keep
them up, please, just a moment.
        Okay. No. 18, Mr. Murray.
        And I can't see the number in the back. What is
your number, ma'am?
        JUROR AMY YOUNG: 24.
        THE COURT: 24? All right.
        And then No. 7 on the front row of the jury box.
        Anyone else? Those three? All right. Thank you
very much.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
At this time, I'm going to call for announcements
on the record in the case of Intellectual Ventures I LLC
versus T-Mobile USA, Inc., et al. This is Civil Case
No. 2:17-CV-577.
        And, counsel, as you give your announcements on
the record, please identify yourselves, the members of your
trial team, and any corporate representatives that you have
with you.
        We'll begin with the Plaintiff. What says the
Plaintiff?
        MR. WARD: Johnny Ward for Intellectual Ventures,
and we are ready, Your Honor. Seated with me at counsel
table, trying this case with me is Mr. Marty Black; Kevin
Flannery; my law partner, Claire Henry; my law partner,
Andrea Fair; and our corporate representative, Mr. John
Paschke from Intellectual Ventures.
        THE COURT: All right. Thank you, counsel.
        What says the Defendants?
        MR. KUBEHL: Good morning, Your Honor. Doug
Kubehl, and with me on the trial team is Ms. Melissa Smith,
Mr. Jonathan Rubenstein, Mr. Jeff Becker for Defendants
Ericsson and T-Mobile. Our corporate representative for
Ericsson is Mr. Johan Norrby, and our corporate
representative for T-Mobile is Mr. Stephen McGrath.
        THE COURT: And you're ready to proceed?
```

MR. KUBEHL: We are ready to proceed, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. Ladies and gentlemen, as I've told you, this is a 3 patent case arising under the patent laws of the United 4 States. 5 What the Plaintiff is claiming in this case is 6 7 that its three patents are being infringed by the Defendants, and it's seeking money damages because of that 8 infringement. 10 The Defendants deny that they are infringing any 11 of the Plaintiff's patents, and they contend that the 12 patents at issue are invalid. 13 Now, what I've just told you is a very simple, very informal description of the case in layman's terms. 14 15 I know that you've each seen the patent video prepared by the Federal Judicial Center. Having seen that, 16 17 you already know more about patent cases than most ordinary 18 citizens do in our area. 19 Now, as I say, the lawyers on both sides are about 20 to question the panel in order to gather additional 21 information that's appropriate to secure a fair and 22 impartial jury and allow them to rightfully exercise their 23 peremptory challenges. 24 Again, there aren't any wrong answers, as long as 25 the answers you give to the questions that you are asked

are fair -- excuse me, full, complete and truthful. 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If, ladies and gentlemen, lawyers for either of the parties ask a question of the panel or any individual panel member that I think is improper, I will certainly stop them and I will certainly tell them.

However, you should understand that these are all experienced trial lawyers. They're familiar and well versed in our Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the local rules of this Court, and I don't expect that to happen.

One thing I want to discuss with you, however, before the lawyers address you, because it's possible that one or more of them may ask you about your ability to apply this if you're selected to serve on the jury, is the burden of proof.

In a patent case, the jury may be called upon to apply two different burdens of proof. The jury may apply a burden of proof known as the preponderance of the evidence. I'll say that again, the preponderance of the evidence. well as a second burden of proof known as clear and convincing evidence. I'll say that again, clear and convincing evidence.

Now, when responding to lawyers' questions about the burden of proof, I need to instruct you that when a party has the burden of proof on any claim or defense by a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

preponderance of the evidence, it means you, the jury, must be persuaded by the credible or believable evidence that that claim or defense is more probably true than not true. I'll say that again, more probably true than not true. Sometimes this is talked about as being the greater weight and degree of credible testimony. Let me give an example that I hope will be helpful. In front of me I think you can see -- all of you can see the statue of the Lady of Justice. She's blindfolded. Her right hand holds the sword of justice which is lowered at her right side. In her left hand, she holds the Scales of Justice which are elevated, and those scales are balanced and equal. If you think about the burden of proof in this way, over the course of the trial, you'll be hearing evidence from both sides. And each side's evidence will go on one side or the other of those scales. And when all the evidence is in, the jury's going to be asked to answer certain questions. And if a party has the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence on any question, if you consider all the evidence placed on one side or the other of those scales, if those scales then tip in favor of that party with the burden of proof, even if they tip ever so

slightly, then that party has met the burden of proof of a

preponderance of the evidence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

On the other hand, ladies and gentlemen, when a party has the burden of proof of proving any defense by clear and convincing evidence, the second burden of proof I mentioned to you, that means that the jury must have an abiding conviction that the truth of the party's factual contentions are highly probable. Let me say that again, an abiding conviction that the truth of the party's factual contentions are highly probable. That's a higher standard of proof or burden of proof than the preponderance of the evidence.

If you think about the example I gave you with regard to this second burden of proof and after the trial and after all the evidence is in, the evidence for both Plaintiffs and Defendants are on one side or the other of those scales, if a party has the burden of proof on any defense by clear and convincing evidence, those -- to meet that burden of proof, those scales must tip in that party's favor, and they must tip definitely. They can't just tip ever so slightly.

If, however, they do tip definitely in that party's favor, then they have met the burden of proof of clear and convincing evidence.

Now, neither of these two burdens of proof that I've talked with about you should be considered or confused

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with a third and different burden of proof that I'm sure you've all heard about on television and movies and in the media, and that third burden of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt.

Beyond a reasonable doubt is a burden of proof that is applied in a criminal case. It has no application whatsoever in a civil case like this.

You should not confuse clear and convincing evidence with beyond a reasonable doubt. It's not as high a burden of proof as beyond a reasonable doubt, but it is a higher burden of proof than the preponderance of the evidence.

I give you these instructions in case the lawyers for one or the other parties in their questioning asks you about your ability to apply those two burdens of proof, the preponderance of the evidence and clear and convincing evidence to the evidence and testimony that's presented in this case.

Now, before the lawyers address the panel, we've come to the point in the process where I'm going to ask each of you to tell me about yourselves, similar things to what I mentioned about myself when we started.

Each of you will find on the screens in front of you, and I think you have laminated cards, as well, nine specific questions that we're going to ask each of you to 1 answer.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And we're going to do this one at a time. We'll begin with Panel Member No. 1, and our Court Security Officer is going to bring a handheld microphone to each of you to use in answering those questions.

When you get that handheld microphone, if you will stand and if you will use that microphone, then answer those nine questions. And then the microphone can be passed to the next member of the panel, they can stand, use the handheld mic, and answer in the same fashion.

Also -- also, ladies and gentlemen, during the lawyers' questioning of the panel as a whole, if you're asked any specific question, you need to wait until the Court Security Officer brings you the microphone before you attempt to answer, and you need to stand and use the handheld microphone when you give your answers.

You can all see there are a lot of people in this It's a large courtroom. And you will not be heard unless you stand and use that handheld microphone when you give your answers. So please remember to do that.

All right. We will begin that process with Panel Member No. 1. If the Court Security Officer will take the microphone to our first panel member.

Mr. Page, if you'll stand and give us your nine -your answers to those nine questions, please.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
JUROR PAGE: Hello everybody. My name is Ruben
Page, and I'm from Pittsburg, Texas. I've lived there
about 38 years.
        I have two daughters. One is 38 that's lived at
home. She has Tourette's. I have another daughter that's
40 -- fixing to turn 42 on the 17th.
        I worked for Luminant for 40 years. A lot of
y'all -- it used to be called TXU. We have a power plant
here in Tatum. On.
         January 8th of last year, they closed three of
our power plants, and I've been unemployed for a year. But
I worked there for 40 years.
        I went to Longview High School, and I graduated in
1972. Three weeks after I graduated, I joined the Marines,
and I spent eight years in the Marines, three years
active -- well, six years, three years active and three
years in reserves.
        My wife's name is Susan Page. She works for
Maven's Menswear. She's a bookkeeper. She's been there
about 20 years. And I was on a criminal trial jury in
Pittsburg a couple of years ago.
        THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you very much.
        If you'll hand the microphone to Ms. Pyle, Panel
Member No. 2.
       Ms. Pyle, if you'll stand and give us your
```

```
answers, please.
1
2
            JUROR PYLE: Okay. My name is Linda Pyle. I live
   in Hallsville, Texas. I have two sons. Jonathan is 34,
3
   and Brandon is 27.
4
            I'm not employed right now. We are -- we own a
5
   family business. We just sold part of it to our -- my son.
6
7
   That's why I'm -- I'm unemployed. I no longer get a
8
   paycheck. But, anyway, it -- what I did was a bookkeeper.
            And do I need to tell the name of the business?
            THE COURT: I'm sorry, ma'am?
10
11
            JUROR PYLE: The name of the business, do I --
12
            THE COURT: Please.
13
            JUROR PYLE: Okay. At that time, it was AutoBody
   Express in Longview. And then we also own Pyle Properties
14
15
   and also Tektra Design & Build. How -- let's see.
   worked for AutoBody Express for right at 15 years.
16
17
   graduated from high school in Louisiana.
18
            My husband's name is Greg Pyle, and he -- he
19
   own -- well, owned AutoBody Express. He's still an officer
20
   on -- in part of AutoBody Express, but -- so he -- he does
21
   the Pyle Properties.
22
             He's an owner -- owner and officer for that, and
23
   then Tektra Design & Build also. I guess he's a member.
24
   And he has been there since '89, so --
25
            THE COURT: Any prior jury service?
```

```
JUROR PYLE: I'm sorry?
1
2
            THE COURT: Do you have any prior jury service?
            JUROR PYLE: Yes. One was a civil, and one was
3
4
   criminal. The second one was like a sentencing.
            THE COURT: And where were those, and when were
5
   those?
6
7
            JUROR PYLE: Here in Harrison County.
            THE COURT: At the county courthouse?
8
            JUROR PYLE: Yes.
9
            THE COURT: And how long ago, Ms. Pyle?
10
11
            JUROR PYLE: The criminal was probably two years
12
   ago, the sentencing. And the one before, that was -- I
13
   mean, several years before that.
            THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. Thank you very
14
15
   much.
16
           If you'll hand the microphone to Panel Member
   No. 3.
17
18
            JUROR MARION: My name is Adam Marion, and I live
   in Gilmer, Texas. I have one 5-year-old.
19
20
            I am working for American Electric Power, and I'm
   the design engineer there. I've been there for 30 days.
21
22
            Before that, I was working at Upshur Rural
23
   Electric in Gilmer. I was there for four and a half years.
24
   Two years ago, I graduated from UT Tyler with my electrical
25
   engineering degree.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
My wife's name is Courtney Marion, and she's a
stay-at-home mom. And I -- my only prior jury was being in
a selection in a -- in Upshur County but didn't get any
further than that.
        THE COURT: All right. You appeared for jury
duty, but you weren't selected?
        JUROR MARION: Yes, sir.
        THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much, sir.
        If you'll pass the microphone to Panel Member
No. 4, Mr. Crabb.
        JUROR CRABB: My name is Martin Crabb. I live in
Omaha, Texas. I have two children, Andy and Chelsea. Andy
is 30, and Chelsea is 26.
        I work for Walmart in Mount Pleasant, Texas. I'm
an assistant manager. I've worked there for 25 years. My
educational background is I went to high school, and that's
it.
        My spouse's name is Judy Crabb. She works for
Everybody's Furniture in Mount Pleasant. She's worked
there for a year. She's in retail sales also. And I don't
have any prior jury service.
        THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you very much.
        Next is Panel Member No. 5, Ms. Howell.
        JUROR HOWELL: My name is Rhonda Howell. I'm from
Gilmer, Texas. I have two sons, 37 and 33.
```

```
I work for Gilmer ISD. I'm a bus driver. I've
1
2
   worked there almost a year. GED, 1981.
3
            My husband's name is Joe. He works at Robroy
   Industries in Gilmer. He's been there 26 years.
4
            And I was on a civil case back in the early '90s.
5
            THE COURT: And where was that, Ms. Howell?
 6
7
            JUROR HOWELL: Gilmer, Upshur County.
            THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
8
9
            No. 6, Mr. Moss.
            JUROR MOSS: My name is John Moss. I've got three
10
11
   kids, 11, 3, and 2 years old.
12
            I work for Stewart & Stevenson in Longview as a
   diesel mechanic. I've been there six months. I graduated
13
14
   from Gilmer High School.
            My wife's name is Amanda Moss. She works for
15
   Peters Chevrolet. She's been there for six months. And
16
17
   I've never had prior jury service.
18
            THE COURT: All right, sir. Next is No. 7,
19
   Mr. Swilley.
20
            JUROR SWILLEY: Yes. Shannon Swilley. I live in
   Elysian Fields, Texas just south of here. Got two kids.
21
22
   My daughter is 17, boy is 11.
23
            I own my own pipe-testing company, oil and gas
   business. Started it in 2010. Education is Elysian Fields
24
25
   High School and TSTC Industrial Maintenance.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Spouse's name is Stacey Swilley. She's -- runs
the Hearts Way Hospice here in Marshall. And she's been
there, I believe, five years. And no jury duty.
        THE COURT: You've never been -- served on a jury?
        JUROR SWILLEY: No, sir.
        THE COURT: Okay. If you'll hand the microphone
to the Court Security Officer, he'll take it around to
Panel Member No. 8, Ms. Vollmer.
        JUROR VOLLMER: Hello. My name is Amber Vollmer.
I live in Hallsville. Been there for about a year and a
half now. I have one little boy, who's 2, and I'm also six
months pregnant with a little girl due in May.
        I work for Walmart on Estes Parkway in Longview.
I've been there probably about a year and a half-ish. I'm
a customer service manager.
        I went to Union Grove High School in Upshur
County, and my sophomore year I decided to leave and finish
out my high school education through Penn Foster. I also
graduated from Vista College as a medical assistant.
        My husband's name is Matthew Vollmer. He works as
a saw operator for Streamflo, the Longview plant. And he's
been there for probably about eight months or so. And I
haven't had any prior jury services.
        THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
        If you'll hand the microphone to Panel Member
```

```
No. 9, Mr. Maxie.
1
2
            JUROR MAXIE: My name is Arlistel Maxie. I have
   three children, three girls, 43, 41, and 37 years of age.
3
            I've been part of Brookshire's Grocery Company for
4
   45 years. I know y'all thought I was 45 years old. I work
5
   in the meat department where I've been for the entire time.
6
7
   I started at 16 years of age. I.
            Have a high school -- graduate of Atlanta High
8
   School in Atlanta, Texas.
9
10
            My spouse's name is Linda Maxie. She's a retired
11
   schoolteacher for 27 years, and I talk about retiring too
12
   much, so she started back to work this year teaching at
   Linden High School in Linden, Texas. She's been there for
13
14
   just this year.
15
            I have been called for jury duty here in Marshall
   one time before, but I was not picked as a juror.
16
17
            THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you very much.
18
            Next is Panel Member No. 10, Mr. Young.
19
            JUROR MICHAEL YOUNG: My name is Michael Young.
20
   live in Bivins, Texas. I have two children, 26 and 22
21
   years of age.
22
            I work for Cooper Tire & Rubber Company. Been
23
   there for three years. Before that, I worked in the
24
   oilfield for various companies for ten years. Before that,
25
   I worked for Frito Lay for nine years. I am divorced and
```

```
never been picked for a jury.
1
2
            THE COURT: All right, sir. Next is No. 11.
            JUROR SHIRLEY: My name is Don Shirley. I live in
3
   Atlanta, Texas. I've got two children, two twin boys, 31
4
   years old.
5
            I work for Bowie-Cass Electric Cooperative. Been
6
7
   there for a little over 29 years. I've got a Bachelor of
8
   Art's degree in English with a minor in history.
            My wife's name is Stephanie. She's a retired
   Texas kindergarten teacher. She was there for 30 years in
10
11
   Atlanta and then in Queen City, Texas. She's been retired
12
   for about five years now. And I've never served on a jury.
            THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you very much.
13
            Next is No. 12.
14
15
            JUROR STRUTTON: Melissa Strutton from Ore City,
   Texas. I have three grown sons, one of which just joined
16
17
   the Navy a few months ago.
18
            I work for Ore City Elementary. I've been the
   secretary there for six years, but I've been there for 16.
19
20
   I graduated high school in Pittsburg, Mississippi.
21
            My husband's name is Joe. He works at Gematsu.
22
   He is a planner. He's been there about 21 years. I did a
23
   criminal case in Upshur County once.
24
            THE COURT: How long ago was that?
25
            JUROR STRUTTON: Probably seven, eight years ago.
```

```
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
1
2
            Next is No. 13, Ms. Thornton.
3
            JUROR THORNTON: My name is Susan Thornton.
   live here in Marshall. I have two children, 30 and 34.
4
            I work for Messick Properties as their business
5
   manager. We own and operate McDonald's restaurants.
6
7
   worked for them for 17 years. I have a degree in
8
   accounting.
            My husband's name is Don. He owns his own
   business and stripes and cleans parking lots, and he
10
   started that business in 2010. And I have never been
11
12
   picked for a jury.
13
            THE COURT: Thank you.
14
            No. 14 is next, Ms. Trammell.
            JUROR TRAMMELL: Tamela Trammell. I have two
15
16
   kids.
17
            I'm employed by Walmart. Been there two years.
18
   I graduated high school, never been married. And I've been
   on a civil jury about five years ago.
19
20
            THE COURT: Where was that, ma'am?
21
            JUROR TRAMMELL: Here in Marshall.
22
            THE COURT: At the county courthouse?
23
            JUROR TRAMMELL: Yes.
24
            THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.
25
            We'll take the microphone around to Panel Member
```

```
No. 15, Mr. Turner.
1
2
            JUROR TURNER: Eldon Turner. I've never been
   married, have no children. I'm 20 years retired Air Force.
3
            Currently work for the City of Longview Compost
4
   Site for 13 years. I've retired there the 16th of
5
   February.
6
7
            THE COURT: Could you hold that microphone a
   little closer, and tell me again what you do for the City
8
   of Longview?
10
            JUROR TURNER: We operate the Compost Site.
11
            THE COURT: Compost Site. Okay. Thank you.
12
            JUROR TURNER: Hallsville high, graduated there.
            Prior jury service, I served here, civil service,
13
   about five years ago.
14
            THE COURT: In this courthouse?
15
16
            JUROR TURNER: Yes, sir.
            THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much, sir.
17
18
            Next is No. 16.
19
            JUROR SCAFF: My name is Deborah Scaff. I go by
20
   Debbie. I have two adult children, 49 and 46.
21
            My place of employment before I retired was the
22
   Texas school system, which I'm very proud of. My
23
   educational background was high school diploma.
24
            My spouse's name is James Scaff. His place of
25
   employment upon retirement was the school system also.
```

```
Prior to that, we both had 27 years in the banking
1
2
   business. I have had no prior jury service at all.
            THE COURT: All right. Next is No. 17,
3
   Ms. Rambin.
4
            JUROR RAMBIN: My name is Mary Rambin. I have two
5
   kids, 15 and 16.
6
7
            I work for Credit Security Group in Longview,
   Texas. We work with mortgage lenders to help people
8
   qualify for homes. I've been there for 15 years.
            I went to high school and did some college for a
10
11
   business degree but never finished.
12
            I am currently going through a divorce, so I don't
   know if that counts for spouse. And I have been summoned
13
   eight times for jury duty, and I got picked for a criminal
14
15
   trial for November in Upshur County.
16
            THE COURT: And so at this point, you're still
   married?
17
18
            JUROR RAMBIN: Yes, sir.
            THE COURT: What does your husband do?
19
20
            JUROR RAMBIN: He works for LeBus International.
   He's an machinist.
21
22
            THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
            No. 18 is next, Mr. Murray.
23
24
            JUROR MURRAY: My name is Barry Murray. I live in
25
   Marshall, Texas. I have four kids, two step kids, from 27
```

```
to 39. I was employed with Sabine Oil & Gas in Kilgore.
1
2
   Unemployed at the time. Excuse me, I worked there for nine
   years. I have a high school diploma from South Louisiana.
3
            My spouse's name is Rebecca Murray. She also
 4
   worked at Sabine Oil & Gas for about three years and is a
5
   stay at home wife now. And I have not been picked for any
6
7
   jury duty.
            THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you very much,
8
   Mr. Murray.
9
10
            We'll take the microphone around to Panel Member
   No. 19, Mr. Willeford.
11
12
            JUROR WILLEFORD: Good morning. I'm Clay
   Willeford. I live in Ore City, Texas. I have four
13
14
   children. My place of employment is Eastern Shore Forest
15
   Products. I'm the general manager there. I'm like Adam,
16
   I've just recently started -- just 30 days at this company.
17
            My educational background, I graduated from Spring
18
   Hill High School, Kilgore College, University of Texas at
   Tyler, and LeTourneau University.
19
20
            My spouse's name is Linda. We've been married 24
21
   years. She works at New Diana Independent School District,
22
   and we have been back in this area for about five years, so
23
   she is actually starting her sixth year there. I have sat
24
   on two jury services, both civil, one federal in Tyler,
25
   roughly 25 years ago and one about 20 years ago locally in
```

```
Greag County.
1
2
            THE COURT: And what does your wife do at the
   school system?
3
 4
            JUROR WILLEFORD: She's a teacher.
            THE COURT: What grade?
 5
            JUROR WILLEFORD: Second grade.
 6
7
            THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
            If you'll pass the microphone to Panel Member.
8
9
            No. 20.
            JUROR WILGUS: My name is Phil Wilgus. I've got
10
11
   four daughters, ranging in age from 18 to 24. My place of
12
   employment -- I currently work for my dad's company. It's
   an underwater construction business. I'm a commercial
13
   diver. I've been working for him for about 30 years.
14
15
            Educational background, I went to Longview High
   School for two years, and I graduated down in Louisiana
16
17
   from a little town called Hornbeck, Louisiana. After that,
18
   I went to commercial diving school and graduated from
   commercial diving school in 1981 and been working for my
19
20
   dad ever since.
21
            My wife's name Jennifer. She is a pharmacy tech
22
   supervisor for Good Shepherd -- Christus Good Shepherd over
23
   in Longview. She's been there about 21, 22 years,
24
   somewhere in there. I have no prior jury service.
25
            THE COURT: All right, sir. If you'll hand the
```

```
microphone to Panel Member No. 21.
1
2
            JUROR MARGERUM: I'm Robert Margerum. I live out
   on Lake Bob Sandlin. I have one 25-year-old daughter who
3
   is a middle school principal in McKinney. I am presently a
4
   special needs bus driver for Pittsburg. I've been doing
5
   that for seven years.
6
7
            I graduated from Arlington High School and then
   attended one year at Tarrant County Junior College.
8
            My wife's name is Sharon Margerum, and she's
   retired. She did drive -- she was a bus monitor for
10
11
   Pittsburg also for four years. And I have four prior jury
12
   summons, one in Parker County, two in Tarrant County, and
   one in Camp County, and they were criminal.
13
            THE COURT: Did you serve on the juries in those
14
15
   cases?
16
            JUROR MARGERUM: Yes.
17
            THE COURT: And how long ago has that been, sir?
18
            JUROR MARGERUM: The one in Camp County was about
   three years ago, and the one in Tarrant County was --
19
20
            THE COURT: Earlier than that?
21
            JUROR MARGERUM: Long time ago.
22
            THE COURT: Thank you, sir. If you'll hand the
   microphone to No. 22, Ms. Johnson.
23
24
            JUROR JOHNSON: Hi. My name is Debra Johnson.
25
   live in Gilmer, Texas. I have two grown children. Retired
```

```
from the U.S. Army, over 20 years of service. Some
1
2
   college. Gerald.
3
            THE COURT: That's your husband's name?
            JUROR JOHNSON: That's my husband's name.
 4
            THE COURT: All right.
 5
            JUROR JOHNSON: He designed offices. He's retired
 6
         And how long did he work doing that? 20 years.
7
            THE COURT: That's fine.
8
9
            JUROR JOHNSON: And no jury service.
            THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.
10
11
            Next is Panel Member No. 23.
12
            JUROR KELLY: My name is Michael Kelly. I have
13
   three children, three girls, three, seven, and 20. Diesel
   truck driver. Work for an oilfield service company.
14
15
   Worked there about 11 years. Got my GED.
            My wife's name is Miranda. We've been together
16
   for about 18 years. She's currently a stay-at-home mom.
17
18
   And she's been doing that for the past seven years. And no
   prior jury service.
19
20
            THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you.
21
            The Court Security Officer will come get the
22
   microphone from you and take it around to Panel Member.
23
   No. 24, Ms. Young.
24
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: My name is Amy Young. I live in
25
   Pittsburg, Texas. I have two sons, 14 and 12. I am a
```

```
first grade teacher at Union Hill ISD, and I've been there
1
2
   for two years.
            I graduated from Henderson High School, Kilgore
3
   College, and UT Tyler with a Bachelor of Science in
4
   interdisciplinary studies.
5
6
            My husband's name is James Young. He works at
7
   Titus Regional Medical Center in Mt. Pleasant. He's the
8
   cath lab manager and also a nurse. He's been there 22
   years. And I have no prior jury service.
            THE COURT: All right, ma'am. Thank you very
10
11
   much.
12
            Next is Panel Member No. 25.
            JUROR BISSET: My name is Connie Bisset. And I
13
   live in Marshall, Texas. I've been here about eight years.
14
15
   I have three kids, ranging 28 to 38. And I work in
16
   Longview at SeeSaw Children's Place. I work as a secretary
17
   in the office -- the administration office there. I quess
18
   I've been there four and a half years.
19
            I went to high school in Great Falls, Montana, and
20
   I went to college in Seattle Pacific in Seattle.
21
            My husband's name is Steve, and we own TMT
22
   Stoneworks and Water Design here in Marshall and actually
23
   all around the area. And we've done that for about 30
24
   years. And I have never been on a jury.
25
           THE COURT: All right, ma'am. Thank you very
```

```
much.
1
2
            Next is No. 26, Mr. Carrington.
            JUROR CARRINGTON: My name is James Carrington.
3
                                                             Ι
   have three kids. I work for Johnson Controls,
4
   Incorporated. I've been there for eight years.
5
            THE COURT: Mr. Carrington, can you hold that mic
6
7
   a little closer? I'm having a hard time hearing you.
            JUROR CARRINGTON: Yes. I work for Johnson
8
9
   Controls, Incorporated. I've been there eight years. I
   graduated high school.
10
11
            Wife's name is Jackie Carrington. She works for
12
   Caddo Parish School Board as a school teacher. And she's
   been there for 11 years. And I have no jury -- prior jury
13
14
   service.
15
           THE COURT: All right, sir.
16
           Next is No. 27, Ms. Allen.
17
            JUROR ALLEN: My name is Lauren Allen. I'm from
18
   Atlanta, Texas. Been there most of my life. I don't have
   any children. I work for McLeod ISD as a high school
19
20
   English teacher. Been there about four years now.
21
            Back in May, I graduated from University of
   Phoenix with a Master's in education. My husband's name is
22
23
   Jeff. He works as a supervisor for Cooper Tire. He's been
24
   there about five years, I believe. And I've never served
25
   on a jury before.
```

```
THE COURT: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
1
2
   next is Ms. Owens, No. 28.
3
            JUROR OWENS: My name is Angela Owens. I'm from
   Diana, Texas. I have three children. My 27-year-old works
4
   for Gregg County Juvenile and Probation Center. Proud mom
5
   of two Army boys, 19 and 21. I'm currently employed with
6
7
   First National Bank of Hughes Springs. Prior to that --
   I've been there about a year. Prior to that, I worked at
8
   Walmart for about 23 years and decided to retire. Went to
   high school at New Diana High School. Got all my schooling
10
11
   there.
12
            Later, I went on to get a certificate of criminal
13
   justice at Kilgore College. Divorced. And about -- end of
   October, beginning of November, I served on a civil case in
14
15
   Upshur County.
16
            THE COURT: All right. Did the jury return a
   verdict in that case, ma'am?
17
18
            JUROR OWENS: I was just an alternative, so I was
19
   dismissed right before they done the verdict.
20
            THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much.
21
            All right. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for
22
   that information.
23
            Now, before the lawyers begin their questioning, I
24
   have a couple more things I need to say to you.
25
            The jurors that are actually selected to serve in
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this case will serve in the role as the judges of the facts. And the jurors selected will make the sole determination about what the facts are in this case.

Now, my job as the Judge is to rule on questions of law, to handle matters relating to evidence and procedure, to maintain the decorum of the courtroom, and to oversee the flow of the trial.

Additionally, I want to say a couple of things to you about our judicial system that I hope will put things in a proper perspective for you.

In any jury trial like this one, besides the parties themselves, there are always three participants, the jury, the Judge, and the lawyers.

With regard to the lawyers, I think it's important for you -- for each of you to understand that our judicial system is an adversary system, which means simply that during a trial, each of the parties will seek to present their respective cases to the jury in the best light possible.

Now, it should be no surprise to any of you that lawyers are often criticized in the media and in the public, but the Court has observed that at least a good bit of that criticism results from a basic misunderstanding about our adversary system where the lawyers act as advocates for the competing parties.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As an advocate, a lawyer is ethically and legally obligated to zealously assert his or her client's rights under the rules of our adversary system.

And by presenting the best case possible on behalf of their clients, the lawyers hopefully will enable the jury to better weigh the relevant evidence, to determine the truth, and arrive at a just verdict based on that evidence.

This adversary system of justice that we have has served our nation well for more than 200 years, and America's lawyers have been and will continue to be an integral and indispensable part of that process.

So as we go forward with this trial, even though it's possible from time to time you say -- you may see me frown or growl at the lawyers, it's simply because I'm trying to make sure that their advocacy doesn't get outside the boundaries of our adversary system.

But keep in mind, please, they are simply doing their jobs, and I think it's important for all of you to be aware of that as we go forward.

Also, ladies and gentlemen, during the course of the trial, I am going to do my very best to make sure that no one on the jury has any idea about what I think about the evidence because evaluating the evidence and from that determining the facts in this case is the job of the jury.

```
It's not my job.
1
2
            So those of you selected to serve on this jury
   should not take any expressions that you see coming from me
3
   or you think you see coming from me as something to
4
   consider or as a factor to take into account in making your
5
   ultimate decision about what the facts are in this case.
6
7
            All right. At this time, the lawyers will address
   the panel. We'll begin with the Plaintiff.
8
            Mr. Ward, you may address the panel on behalf of
   the Plaintiff. Would you like a warning on your time?
10
11
            MR. WARD: I would, Your Honor, a five-minute
12
   warning.
            THE COURT: All right. You may proceed when
13
14
   you're ready.
15
            MR. WARD: Good morning. As I mentioned earlier,
   my name is Johnny Ward, and I represent Intellectual
16
   Ventures. And I'll refer to them shorthand sometimes as
17
18
   IV, so I'm not talking about what goes in your -- your arm,
   but that's shorthand that we refer to them, IV.
19
            You all have told us a little bit about
20
   yourselves. I'm going to tell you briefly about myself.
21
   I've got three children, a 20-year-old in college, an
22
23
   18-year-old senior in high school, and a 16-year-old
24
   sophomore. They're both at Longview High School.
25
           My practice is over in Longview. It's a law firm
```

```
called Ward, Smith & Hill. I've been practicing law --
1
2
   this is my 24th year. My wife was a school teacher at
   Longview High School. We've been married for 21 years.
3
   She retired to do what I say is the hard job, and that's
   raise those kids.
            I've never served on a jury. I've picked lots of
6
7
   juries. I've tried lots of cases, but for some reason I
8
   always get struck.
            I tend to know everybody in the -- in the
   courtroom. I want to be on one, but unlike you all, y'all
10
11
   probably want to get out of here. But I do want to be on a
12
   jury. And I do thank you for being here.
           Now, I told you just a little bit about myself.
13
   You've told us a little bit about yourselves. You probably
14
15
   wouldn't want to hire me as your lawyer unless you know a
   little bit more, would you?
16
17
            Anybody ready to hire me? No. This is a really
18
   important case, and that's why Judge Gilstrap gives us 30
19
   minutes, which is not a lot of time -- it goes by
20
   quickly -- to ask you all some questions about yourselves
21
   to find out if you're the right juror for this case.
22
            I'm going to tell you briefly about the case.
23
   Y'all have figured out that it's a lawsuit involving a
24
   dispute over patents. And these are the three patents.
25
   Those of you that make it on the jury will hear a lot more
```

1 about the patents in this case. 2 You'll also get to hear from the inventor, a gentleman named Jacob Jorgensen. He lives in Folsom, 3 California. And he'll tell you about his invention. 4 It relates generally to intelligent base stations 5 that deliver high quality service over a wireless network. 6 7 That's a mouthful, and you'll learn a lot more about it if 8 you make it on the jury. Now, the Defendants say we're not trespassing on these patents. They deny that, all right? They also say 10 11 if they don't trespass, the patents are all invalid. 12 And they also say -- there's a big dispute about 13 how much money they owe if they're wrong on both of those 14 questions. 15 So we say it's \$77 million. They say it's 158,000. So that's kind of the general parameters of the 16 17 dispute. I'm not going to talk to you about the evidence, 18 but you all can tell there's a dispute about a lot of things in this case. 19 20 I do want you to -- to encourage you to speak up. I'm going to call on you by name because I know none of us 21 22 know each other, at least I don't think we know each other, and I'm not picking on you, but I want to -- I want to 23

learn some more about you to see if you're the right juror for this case, because when you came to the courthouse this

24

morning, did everyone want to be fair? 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think you're -- anyone want to be unfair, just based on what they know so far, that they've got a bone to pick, and they want to be unfair to somebody.

Typically not. But would y'all agree with me that depending upon your life experience, that might impact your ability to be fair to both sides in a case. And I'll give you an example.

If you were in a -- let's say a plaintiff in a car wreck. Mr. Page, let's say you had a claim, and you were a plaintiff in a car wreck case, and you got called for jury service, and there was a jury, and it was a jury trial involving a car wreck, and there was a plaintiff sitting right on the table close to you, and there was a defendant at this table.

You might not be the right juror for that case because you might start out leaning. Not that you're an unfair person, but because of what's going on in your life right now or what's happened in the past might impact your ability to be fair.

So that's what we're trying to find out. Is there anything that makes you not the right juror for this case? And that's what we'll be asking about.

So I want to start out by asking if anyone knows Melissa Smith. She's an attorney, and she practices here

```
in Marshall, the law firm of Gillam & Smith. Does anyone
1
2
   know Ms. Smith?
            And when I say know, I'm using the broadest sense
3
   of the term. I recognize her. My kids go to school with
4
   her kids or for any reason. Maybe you know someone at her
5
   law firm. Her law partner is Gil Gillam.
6
7
            I don't see anyone raising their hand that knows
   Ms. Smith or Mr. Gillam.
8
            There's also a lawyer in their office whose name
   is Bobby Lamb. Does anyone know Mr. Lamb?
10
11
            With Ms. Smith is a law firm called Baker Botts.
12
   They're a large -- large law firm all over the country.
            I don't think that anyone will know any lawyers
13
   there, but maybe have been represented by them or maybe you
14
15
   know somebody. I shouldn't assume anybody.
16
            Anybody know the law firm of Baker Botts or ever
   been represented by them, have family members that work for
17
18
   that law firm.
            All right. Here's my next question about jury
19
20
   service. A number of you indicated that you have been
21
   jurors before in jury trials. Has anyone ever been the
22
   foreperson on a jury?
23
            And I'm going to do it in this way: First row,
24
   Mr. Page? Yes, sir. Can I ask you a question about that?
25
            JUROR PAGE:
                         Sure.
```

```
MR. WARD: You were the foreperson?
1
2
            JUROR PAGE: Yes, sir, I was.
            MR. WARD: How long ago was that?
 3
            JUROR PAGE: About five years ago.
 4
            MR. WARD: And what type was case was it?
 5
            JUROR PAGE: Well, it was a criminal case. A guy
6
7
   had hit a deputy going to work one day. She was 38 years
   old. He was drunk. And we convicted him, but we didn't
8
   find out until after the trial that he actually had a
   bottle of whiskey in his boot.
10
11
            MR. WARD: Wow.
12
            JUROR PAGE: But he killed this 38-year-old woman
   and two kids.
13
14
            MR. WARD: Terrible.
            Okay. And you said you worked for Luminant for
15
   40 years?
16
17
            JUROR PAGE: Yes, I did.
18
            MR. WARD: Were you an operator there?
19
            JUROR PAGE: Yes, I was.
20
            MR. WARD: What specifically did you do?
21
            JUROR PAGE: Well, I was a dragline operator and
22
   run shuttles, backhoes, and then in April 15th of 2016,
23
   they closed three lines.
24
            MR. WARD: Okay.
            JUROR PAGE: I was advised to go to the power
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
plant, and I went over there, and I run front-end loaders
and dozers for the past two years.
        MR. WARD: Okay. Thank you, sir.
        Let me talk to you a little bit about IV and what
business they're in. Obviously, they have filed this
lawsuit against T-Mobile and Ericsson, and you all are
going to hear about that dispute.
        You're going to learn that IV is a company that
owns tens of thousands of patents. It does a number of
different businesses, but one of those businesses is
licensing these patents.
        They acquire patents from inventors, from
different companies. In this case, you'll learn they
bought these patents out of a bankruptcy.
        Now, they've obviously filed this lawsuit against
these companies. Those of you that make it on the jury
have -- will find out that they have found -- they have
filed other lawsuits. They've filed dozens of lawsuits,
all right?
        So here's my question: I know y'all have answered
a questionnaire, and that gave us a lot of information
about some feelings and opinions that you all have, and
that helps speed this process up.
        Here's my question to you: It might be perfectly
legal -- and I want to know if you feel this way. It might
```

```
be perfectly legal to buy patents and file lawsuits, but I
1
 2
   don't like it, all right?
            If you feel that way, raise your hand, and I want
 3
   to talk to you about it.
 4
            Ms. Howell, you and I were grinning at each other.
 5
   Let me find out if you -- what you were grinning about.
 6
7
   Maybe it wasn't about my question. Not at all. I missed
 8
   something.
            Okay. Well, let me ask you, since I've called on
   you, tell me how you feel about that. Does that start you
10
11
   leaning one way or the other before you've heard any
12
   evidence in this case?
13
            JUROR HOWELL: No, sir.
14
            MR. WARD: Okay. And remind me what you -- you do
15
   for a living.
16
            JUROR HOWELL: I drive a school bus for Gilmer
17
   ISD.
18
            MR. WARD: That's right. That's right.
19
            All right. Thank you, ma'am.
20
            Ms. Pyle, we just got your questionnaire this
21
   morning, and that's where I got some information about your
   feelings on lawsuits, and I read through it pretty quickly
22
23
   because there were 17 of them, and I felt like I had about
24
   five minutes to get through them.
25
            Tell me about what I've just told you about, IV
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

```
and what part of its business is. Does that start you
   leaning one way or the other, given your feelings about
   lawsuits?
           JUROR PYLE: I don't think so.
           MR. WARD: Okay.
           JUROR PYLE: I don't think so.
           MR. WARD: Okay. And I always -- I always get
   concerned when people say: I don't think so. It might.
           And -- and is that what you're telling me? It
   might affect you?
           JUROR PYLE: It may.
           MR. WARD: Okay. And that's okay. And, look,
   there are no wrong answers. You can't give a wrong answer.
            I just want to find out if you start leaning one
   way or the other in this case before you've heard evidence,
   and there's -- there's nothing wrong with that. Leaning
   doesn't disqualify you.
           JUROR PYLE: No.
           MR. WARD: So when you say you sort of feel that
   way, tell me what you feel just based on what I've told
   you.
           JUROR PYLE: Well, I guess them having lots of
23
   lawsuits, that kind of --
           MR. WARD: That starts you going: Hmm, I'm not --
           JUROR PYLE: Yes.
```

```
MR. WARD: -- I'm not sure I like their business.
1
2
            JUROR PYLE: I mean, yeah.
3
            MR. WARD: That's --
            JUROR PYLE: I mean, I don't know any details, but
 4
   that does kind of strike me as --
5
6
            MR. WARD: Okay. Something that you look at them
7
   a little bit differently.
8
            JUROR PYLE: Exactly.
9
            MR. WARD: Like would it be fair to say that based
   upon what I've told you about their business, maybe we
10
11
   don't start out on the exact same level with T-Mobile and
12
   IV -- I'm -- I'm IV -- T-Mobile and Ericsson?
            Would that be fair, that we don't start out --
13
   before we start the evidence, just based upon their
14
15
   business, we don't start out on the same footing?
16
            JUROR PYLE: I don't quite understand what you're
   asking.
17
18
            MR. WARD: Okay. It's a bad question.
19
            JUROR PYLE: Okay.
20
            MR. WARD: All right. You said that you -- you
   have some concerns about their business.
21
22
            JUROR PYLE: Uh-huh.
23
            MR. WARD: And you start the case -- just based on
24
   what I've told you their business is, is it fair to say
25
   that we might not start out dead even fair with these
```

```
Defendants?
1
2
            JUROR PYLE: Right. Right.
3
            MR. WARD: Okay. And that's regardless of what I
   tell you the facts are -- and I'm not going to get into
4
           Maybe I could --
5
   those.
6
            JUROR PYLE: Right.
7
            MR. WARD: -- persuade you to bring us back --
            JUROR PYLE: I mean, I can listen and, you know,
8
   work through the --
10
            MR. WARD: Okay.
11
            JUROR PYLE: -- try to figure it out myself --
12
            MR. WARD: Okay.
            JUROR PYLE: -- with the others.
13
            MR. WARD: But we start out maybe a little bit
14
   behind before --
15
16
            JUROR PYLE: Right.
17
            MR. WARD: Okay. Fair enough.
18
            Who agrees with Ms. Pyle? And I'm going to do it
19
   this way: In the first row, anyone agree with Ms. Pyle's
20
   feelings about what I told you about IV and its business?
21
            Mr. Marion, I'll just pass the mic to you.
22
            Ms. Pyle, you can pass the mic to Mr. Marion.
23
            THE COURT: Let me interrupt just a minute.
24
            Two things that are important that I need to
25
   remind everybody of. Everything that's said in the
```

```
courtroom is taken down as a part of the transcript by the
1
 2
   court reporter.
 3
            So if you say huh-uh, it doesn't translate into a
 4
   yes or no. You need to say yes or no, verbalize your
   answers.
 6
            And also, it's very important that you wait until
7
   the question is finished before you give the answer, and I
   assure you the lawyers will wait until you've finished the
 8
   answer before they ask the next question. People talking
   at the same time are a real problem.
10
11
            So if we can avoid those two things, it'd be real
12
   helpful.
            All right, Mr. Ward. Go ahead.
13
14
            MR. WARD: Thank you, Your Honor.
15
            Mr. Marion, congratulations on starting a new job.
16
            JUROR MARION: Thank you.
17
            MR. WARD: Do you have any feelings one way or the
18
   other, based on what I've told you, about IV and its
19
   business?
20
            JUROR MARION: No, sir.
21
            MR. WARD: Okay. I'll go right next to you.
22
            Mr. Crabb, I know you worked at -- or you still
23
   work at Walmart, correct?
24
            JUROR CRABB: Yes, sir, correct.
25
            MR. WARD: You all get a number of slip-and-fall
```

```
lawsuits or claims made over the years, I believe; is that
1
2
   fair?
            JUROR CRABB: Yes, sir.
3
 4
            MR. WARD: I don't know if that impacts your
   ability to -- if you start out leaning one way or the other
5
   in this case. You tell me. Do you lean one way or the
6
7
   other?
8
            JUROR CRABB: No, sir. No, sir.
            MR. WARD: Do you lean one way or the other based
9
   on what I've told you about IV and its business model?
10
11
            JUROR CRABB: No.
12
            MR. WARD: Okay. Anybody else in the front row?
   I've got limited time so I'm going to try to go front row,
13
   second row, and then I'll go out here in the gallery, third
14
15
   row, fourth row, fifth row.
            Okay. Anyone agree with what's -- with what
16
   Ms. Pyle told me, that maybe IV starts out a little bit
17
18
   behind before they've heard evidence. Let me ask in the
19
   second row.
20
            And, Mr. Shirley, we made -- I made eye contact,
   and I know you're shaking your head. I wanted to follow up
21
22
   with you and ask you, I didn't quite catch what you do for
23
   a living.
            JUROR SHIRLEY: I work for an electric --
24
            MR. WARD: I think you -- you need the microphone.
25
```

```
THE COURT: And if you will stand up, please, sir.
1
            JUROR SHIRLEY: I work for an electric
2
   cooperative, do IT for the engineering department.
3
            MR. WARD: That's right.
 4
            Have you ever done any work in wireless
5
   communications?
6
7
            JUROR SHIRLEY: Actually, yes, sir.
            MR. WARD: Okay. Tell me a little bit about what
8
   you've done, what type of work you've done in wireless
10
   communication.
11
            JUROR SHIRLEY: Part of the work that I do is
12
   communications to substations. We have 30 substations that
13
   are remotely located throughout our system, and we keep
   track of SCADA, which is data acquisition and
14
   communications to these substation.
15
16
            And some of that is done through wireless, and
   some of it is done through DSL connections and so forth.
17
18
   But, yes, sir.
19
            MR. WARD: All right. Do you do any business with
20
   T-Mobile or Ericsson? I say you. Does your company do any
21
   business with either of these companies?
22
            JUROR SHIRLEY: No, sir.
23
            MR. WARD: Anything about the fact that you've got
24
   some experience in wireless start you leaning one way or
25
   the other in this case just based on what I've told you who
```

```
the parties are and what the technology is?
1
 2
            JUROR SHIRLEY: No, sir.
            MR. WARD: All right. Thank you, sir.
 3
 4
            Let me go to the third row. I don't -- I hadn't
   asked anybody. Anyone have strong feelings one way or the
 5
   other about what I've told you about what IV's business is?
 6
 7
            Fourth row?
 8
            Yes, sir. Juror No. 21, Mr. Margerum?
            JUROR MARGERUM: It's just when I heard they file
 9
   numerous lawsuits, it makes me think, well, maybe they're
10
11
   making money off of lawsuits instead of the product.
12
            MR. WARD: Well, and I'll tell you -- and that's a
13
   good point, and I'll tell you some more about this company.
   That's -- that's part of what they have to do.
14
15
            They own patents -- and you all will learn that
   there are no patent police. We can't call someone -- when
16
17
   you own 10,000 patents and you find out that someone is
18
   trespassing on one of them, this is where we come, okay?
19
   We come to a courthouse and ask a jury.
20
            You don't have to agree with that, and it sounds
21
   like you might not agree with what they've got to do to
   protect their property. Is that -- would that be a fair
22
23
   statement?
24
            JUROR MARGERUM: Well, I'd have to hear the whole
25
   case.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MR. WARD: I understand. But before you've heard
the evidence in the case, do you start leaning a little bit
in favor of these Defendants just based on what I've told
you about IV's business?
        JUROR MARGERUM: Yes.
        MR. WARD: All right. And that's regardless of
what I tell you the law or whether it's right or wrong;
that's just a feeling you have; you start out leaning.
        JUROR MARGERUM: Right now, but I can be
persuaded --
        MR. WARD: Okay.
        JUROR MARGERUM: -- seeing the facts.
        MR. WARD: All right. Thank you, Mr. Margerum.
        Anybody else in the third -- fourth row agree with
Mr. Margerum?
        And then back row? Anyone on the back row agree
with Mr. Margerum's statements?
        How many of y'all have heard about a little trade
war going on between the United States and China? Everyone
heard about that -- that trade war?
        Have you heard about the disputes between the
United States and China about respecting intellectual
property?
        All right. And I think that's why you might hear
more about patents these days. There's -- there's some
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
studies that say that as much as 40 percent of the U.S.
economy is tied to intellectual property. There's lots of
patents.
        And as you all know, we're moving more and more to
an information society, and technology is at the forefront
of -- of U.S. business. And you're going to find out that
IV is there as well with the number of patents it owns.
        And that's why I tell you that with all these
patents that they own, there are -- there's no other forum
for them to resolve these disputes except in the
courthouse.
        So I'm going to finish -- finish this -- this
section there, and that is, has everyone told me if you
start out leaning in favor of these Defendants before we
get to the evidence just based upon IV's business? This
is -- I'm not going to ask any more questions.
        Anyone in the jury box?
        Anyone in the gallery?
        All right. Can I see a show of hands for folks
that have been either personally or their business has been
a defendant in a lawsuit?
        All right. Mr. Murray?
        JUROR MURRAY: Yes.
        MR. WARD: A civil lawsuit?
        JUROR MURRAY: Yeah. I worked with Sabine, and
```

```
we've had a lot of claims made against us for saltwater
1
2
   truck drivers and whatnot.
            MR. WARD: Okay. Anything about that experience
3
   that starts you leaning in favor of the Defendant or
4
   against the Plaintiff? Obviously, we've brought this
5
   lawsuit.
6
7
            JUROR MURRAY: We ended up having a lot of
   frivolous lawsuits, but I don't think it'd affect my...
8
            MR. WARD: Wouldn't affect -- affect your opinion
   in this case?
10
11
            JUROR MURRAY: I don't think so.
12
            MR. WARD: Okay. Anybody else whose business or
   individually -- individually you've been involved in a
13
14
   lawsuit?
15
            What about as a witness in a lawsuit?
            All right. Got a hand up. Mr. Kelly?
16
17
            JUROR KELLY: When I worked for Bolt Oilfield
18
   Transport, we had a driver that was drinking on the job.
   Ran a stop sign, hit a car. The car hit a man and knocked
19
20
   him through a plate glass window.
21
            And prior to that warning, he had been -- he had
22
   been drinking on the job, and we thought he was going to be
23
   terminated.
24
            But our supervisor put him back in a truck and put
25
   him back to work. So after I left that job, they came and
```

```
asked me if I knew anything about it, and I had personal
1
2
   knowledge of it, so...
3
            MR. WARD: Okay. You were a witness?
            JUROR KELLY: Yeah.
 4
            MR. WARD: Anything about that experience,
5
   Mr. Kelly, that starts you leaning one way or the other in
6
7
   this case?
8
            JUROR KELLY: No, sir.
9
            MR. WARD: Okay. Thank you. We all hear about
   frivolous lawsuits, right? And there are a lot of them,
10
11
   right?
12
            Everyone agree you hear about frivolous lawsuits?
   Everyone think frivolous lawsuits are bad for the system?
13
14
            Anyone think frivolous lawsuits are good for the
15
   system? They -- they're expensive. They slow down our
16
   ability to get to court because you've got to deal with
   those cases.
17
18
            Here's my question, though, anybody in the jury
   box feel like there are more frivolous lawsuits than there
19
20
   are valid lawsuits?
21
            When I say a valid lawsuit, a legitimate dispute
22
   where parties can't reach an agreement versus a frivolous
23
   lawsuit where there's no basis. Anyone feel that way, that
   there's more frivolous lawsuits?
24
25
           All right. Mr. -- Mr. Page, you feel like there's
```

```
more frivolous lawsuits than there are legitimate lawsuits?
1
2
            JUROR PAGE: Yes, I do.
            MR. WARD: Okay. And why do you feel that way?
3
            JUROR PAGE: I don't know. I read a lot. I -- I
 4
   enjoy reading, and I just see a lot of people suing people
5
   for seems like no reason.
6
7
            MR. WARD: All right. And given the fact that you
   feel like there's more frivolous lawsuits than valid
8
   lawsuits, do you have some concern in your mind that, well,
   maybe this is one of those frivolous lawsuits?
10
11
            JUROR PAGE: No.
12
            MR. WARD: Okay. We don't need to worry about
13
   that. You're not leaning one way or the other?
14
            JUROR PAGE: No.
15
            MR. WARD: All right. Ms. Pyle, you've told me
   about your feelings. Do you feel like before we get
16
17
   started here, are you concerned, well, maybe this is one of
18
   those frivolous lawsuits?
19
            JUROR PYLE: Not necessarily.
20
            MR. WARD: Okay.
21
            JUROR PYLE: I mean, no.
22
            MR. WARD: Okay.
23
            JUROR PYLE: I'll say no.
24
            MR. WARD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Pyle.
25
            All right. Is that everybody in the jury box?
```

```
Let's go -- yes, sir, Juror No. 9, Mr. Maxie?
1
2
            JUROR MAXIE: Yes, sir. In my line of work, which
   is the grocery company, I witness a lot of self-spills, and
3
   I go around the corner for a second and come back and see
   them.
5
            I've actually witnessed those things for 45 years.
6
7
   But that does not affect my judgment on a civil case.
            MR. WARD: You don't start out leaning one way or
8
   the other?
10
            JUROR MAXIE: No, sir.
11
            MR. WARD: You work at -- or you still work at
12
   Brookshire's?
13
            JUROR MAXIE: Brookshire's Grocery.
            MR. WARD: Yes, sir. You know my law partner, Wes
14
   Hill? He worked at -- at Brookshire's for a number of
15
16
   years. Do you know Mr. Hill?
17
            JUROR MAXIE: No, I don't know him personally.
18
            MR. WARD: Okay. He tells me about some of the
19
   crazy things that happen in Brookshire's late at night.
20
   There's crazy stuff going on there, isn't there?
21
            JUROR MAXIE: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
22
            MR. WARD: All right. Thank you, sir.
23
            Ms. Howell, let me follow up with you, Juror.
24
   No. 5. I think you indicated in your questionnaire that
25
   you had some strong opinions about lawsuits.
```

```
JUROR HOWELL: Yes, sir.
1
            MR. WARD: Okay. Tell me -- tell me about those
2
   opinions about lawsuits.
3
            JUROR HOWELL: Well, I just think that if the
4
   government is involved, if somebody has something -- the
5
6
   little person and the government's trying to take it, I'm
7
   always going to be for the little person.
8
            MR. WARD: Okay.
9
            JUROR HOWELL: It's just, you know -- I stand
   behind the government on certain things, but there's
10
11
   certain things I will not stand behind the government on.
12
            MR. WARD: All right. Well, the good news is the
   government's not involved in this one. But that's what
13
   you're referring to are lawsuits involving the government?
14
15
            JUROR HOWELL: Yes, yes.
            MR. WARD: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
16
17
            All right. Let me ask you about -- Your Honor,
18
   how am I doing on time?
19
            THE COURT: You've got about two minutes before
20
   your warning.
21
            MR. WARD: Okay. I thought I was getting close.
            T-Mobile -- T-Mobile is one of the -- the
22
23
   Defendants in this case. Is there anyone in the jury box
24
   who owns a T-Mobile phone?
25
            All right. How about in the third, fourth, or
```

```
fifth row, anyone that owns T-Mobile or has T-Mobile as
1
2
   their service provider? Nobody?
            How about AT&T? If you own AT&T -- if AT&T is
3
   your service provider? Verizon? Y'all -- you all see
4
   these commercials on TV.
5
            There's pretty stiff competition, right? Anyone
6
7
   feel like competition is a bad thing for us as consumers?
   If you think competition is bad in business, raise your
8
   hand. Nobody, right? Competition is good.
10
            You think that all these companies ought to have
11
   to play by the same rules. Should they play by the same
12
   rules, or should some play by a different set of rules?
   Anyone feel like it's okay for companies to play by a
13
14
   different set of rules?
            Let me talk to you briefly about patents and what
15
   it takes to be held liable.
16
17
            You don't have to know about a patent in order to
18
   infringe it, all right? I think His Honor will instruct
   the jury at the close of this case that knowledge of a
19
20
   patent is not necessary to prove infringement.
21
            Obviously, they know about the patent once the
22
   lawsuit gets filed, but you can be liable for trespassing
23
   on a patent if you claim you didn't know anything about it.
24
            Anybody sitting there right now in the jury box,
```

say, you know what, that might be the law, but it doesn't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
seem fair that you can be held liable for infringement if
you didn't know about the patent? Anyone feel that way?
        I tell you what, I haven't talked to Juror No. 7,
Mr. -- is it Swilley?
        JUROR SWILLEY: Yes, sir.
        MR. WARD: You got any feelings one way or the
other? You probably haven't thought about patent
infringement ever in your life until I asked that question,
have you?
        JUROR SWILLEY: No, sir.
        MR. WARD: Does that seem strange to you that you
could be held liable for patent infringement if you didn't
know about the patent?
        JUROR SWILLEY: No, sir.
        MR. WARD: Okay. Anybody have a feeling one way
or the other, say, you know what, that might be the law,
but I don't agree with it?
        And I'll tell you, it's -- patents are like other
property. If I own a piece of property -- let's say I'm
fortunate enough to own the minerals under it, and
Exxon-Mobil comes out and drills a well and they take oil
and gas out from under the property and they take it for 10
years and I figure it out and I say, y'all have been taking
my oil and gas for 10 years. And they say, oh, well, we
didn't know it was your property, no harm, no foul.
```

```
THE COURT: Five minutes remaining.
1
2
            MR. WARD: Who'd feel that way? No harm, no foul,
   you didn't know. That's not the way it works, is it? You
3
   trespass -- yes, ma'am, I saw -- Ms. Johnson?
4
            JUROR JOHNSON: Well, I would just --
5
6
            MR. WARD: Hold on -- hold on just a second.
7
   You've got to have the microphone.
            JUROR JOHNSON: I would just say that that's not
8
   right, and as long as everybody follows the law --
9
10
            MR. WARD: Right.
            JUROR JOHNSON: -- you know, you can't be wrong,
11
12
   but --
13
            MR. WARD: And if His Honor instructs you that
   knowledge of a patent is not necessary to prove
14
15
   infringement, could you follow that?
16
            JUROR JOHNSON: Well, if somebody was on my
   property taking my minerals and gold and all, I would go
17
18
   after them, yes.
19
            MR. WARD: You kind of got two options, don't you?
20
   You can do nothing about it, or you can do something about
21
   it, right?
22
            JUROR JOHNSON: Right. I would do something about
23
   it.
24
            MR. WARD: All right. Thank you, ma'am.
25
            Anyone disagree with Ms. Johnson, that if someone
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
is trespassing on your property, you wouldn't do anything
about it, you'd just let them trespass? Anyone feel that
way?
        I told you we seek to recover up to $77 million in
damages, all right?
        My question is not about the damages in this case.
It's about damages in general. Anyone sitting there right
now -- I'll start out in the jury box -- say, you know
what, that's a lot of money, and I don't care what the
facts are, I could never award that amount of money to a
company like IV? Anyone in the jury box feel that way? If
you do, raise your hand.
        Third row?
        Fourth row?
        Fifth row?
        Two last areas. One is technical knowledge, all
right? And I know that -- let's see, Mr. Shirley has got
technical knowledge.
        There's some folks that are the person that
everyone comes to when their cell phone breaks, their
laptop breaks, iPod is not working. I'm one of those.
        I like all those gadgets, but if they don't work
when I try to turn them on, I take them to my kids and get
them to reboot or whatever they've got to do.
        Is there anyone on the jury panel that is that
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
person, that is the person that people bring their
electronics to when they break? Anyone on the jury box is
that person?
        All right. Mr. Marion.
        How about third, fourth, or fifth row? Anybody
that -- that person?
        All right. I know I'm out of time. I've got one
last question for you all. I've tried to cover a lot. You
all have given us a lot of information.
        But is there anyone sitting there right now
saying, you know what, if Mr. Ward had asked this question,
he would know that I'm not the right juror for this case
because I'm leaning against IV?
        Is there anyone in the jury box that feels that
way? And we can talk about it at the -- up at the bench if
it's something that you want to talk about in private.
        But this is kind of my last chance to talk to you.
Anyone feeling that way, that there's a question I didn't
ask that you think is information -- you've got information
that's important to know?
        Yes, sir?
        JUROR SHIRLEY: Can I talk to you up here?
        MR. WARD: We can. We'll do that -- we'll do that
at the end. We'll just make a note.
        Anybody else in the jury box?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Yes, sir? Is it Wilgus -- Mr. Wilgus? Is there
something that you want to talk about in private?
        JUROR WILGUS: Yes, sir.
        MR. WARD: Okay. Mr. Wilgus -- he's Juror No. 20.
        Anybody else?
        All right. I appreciate your time. I appreciate
you answering my questions and bearing with me. We look
forward to presenting this case to the eight of you that
are selected for the jury.
        THE COURT: All right. Ms. Smith, you may address
the panel on behalf of the Defendants. Would you like a
warning on your time?
        MS. SMITH: I'd like five minutes, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: All right. You may proceed when
you're ready.
        MS. SMITH: May it please the Court.
        THE COURT: Proceed.
        MS. SMITH: Good morning, everybody. I tend to
look forward. But good morning to those of you on the
third, fourth, and fifth row, as well.
        My name is Melissa Smith, and I'm proud to be here
this morning representing T-Mobile and Ericsson.
        Mr. Ward abbreviated his client's name, and I'll
do the same. I often just say T-MO.
        I'll start with the most important thing I'm going
```

```
to do this morning, and that's thank each of you.
1
 2
             On behalf of the trial team here at the table and
   our clients, Ericsson and T-MO, we know that every hour,
 3
 4
   every minute you spend here in the courtroom, the time you
   spent filling out the questionnaires in advance of today is
 5
   time away from your work, your family, and your
 6
7
   obligations. And we really appreciate that.
 8
            The other -- my clients also asked me to thank
   even possibly more importantly, Mr. Page, Mr. Turner,
9
   Ms. Johnson, and the two Army boys that Ms. Owens has.
10
11
   Thank you for your service.
12
            Now, you all have -- you've shared some
   information about yourselves. You've answered questions
13
   from the Court. You've answered questions from Mr. Ward.
14
15
            And so before I -- I'm the last one to ask you
   questions, I'll tell you that, but before I start doing
16
   that, I'll tell you a little bit about myself.
17
18
            I graduated from UT Austin undergrad, and then
19
   like Judge Gilstrap, I went to Baylor Law School. That was
20
   a little over 22 years ago. And I moved to Marion County
21
   22 years ago, about two or three miles outside of
22
   Jefferson. Took a job here on the Marshall courthouse
23
   square. I was working -- my boss was a guy named Gil
24
   Gillam.
            Eventually I convinced him to be his partner.
25
                                                            So
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
now it's called Gillam & Smith. And we practice in this
old yellow house that sits right behind this courthouse.
        Personally, I am married to a gentleman Steven,
who is retired law enforcement. And we were blessed a
little bit later in life, but we were blessed nonetheless
with a seven-year-old boy and a five-year-old girl.
        I used to stand up here and talk about all the
great hobbies, I used to ride horses and do all those
things, but now I just have time for work and kids. And
that's -- that's about all.
        T-Mobile, my first client -- it's an easy task to
introduce T-Mobile. For those of you that watched -- did
anybody watch the Super Bowl last night? Mr. Page,
Mr. Murray, okay. We've got to take into account all these
Saints fans, right? There were commercials.
        So for those of you -- I saw on your
questionnaires some of you knew T-Mobile, some of you
didn't know T-Mobile, but we had some -- commercials on
last night, so for those of you that watched, you may know
a little bit more about us - - --
        They've actually been in the telecommunications
industry for almost 30 years. And what you're going to --
how you'll get to know them more in this case, though, is
```

what you need to know about them is that they're really

Ericsson's customer. That's the role they're going to play

in this case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And that brings us to Ericsson. Ericsson is a technology company that actually goes back to the 1800s, believe it or not. Not a household name, so many of you might not have known them.

I studied your questionnaires, and I saw that on the questionnaires. But when you hear 1G, 2G, 3G, 4G, I see some shaking heads -- Ms. Pyle -- that's actually probably services you use, and that's Ericsson technology.

And so you may be using our products and not actually realize it.

Now, Judge Gilstrap gives us just a few minutes to tell you what to look forward to if you're lucky enough to be chosen, and he held up some patents, and he talked about trespass.

What I will tell you is this: This is what you need to know from T-MO and Ericsson. Our position is that Ericsson came up with the products -- the base stations are what are accused in this case -- and that we came up with those products on our own, and we use new, advanced 4G technology, not old 2G technology.

And what you'll find, if you're lucky enough to be chosen, is that Ericsson's products operate very, very differently than Plaintiff says they do.

Now, it's my turn to ask a few questions. So --

```
and I'm going to start with probably people that we haven't
1
 2
   heard from as much this morning.
 3
            Let's see, who's ever watched CSI, any type of
   crime show?
 4
            Ms. Rambin, let's start with you.
 5
 6
            All right. Now, I've often had -- let me give you
7
   some time to get over there.
            I've often had an experience -- good morning.
 8
 9
            JUROR RAMBIN: Good morning.
10
            MS. SMITH: When I'm watching and I'm watching for
11
   about five or ten minutes, and I think, well, I know -- I
12
   know who done it.
13
            Have you had that similar experience?
14
            JUROR RAMBIN: Yes.
15
            MS. SMITH: Do you turn the TV off and stop
16
   watching?
17
            JUROR RAMBIN: No.
18
            MS. SMITH: Why?
19
            JUROR WILLEFORD: Because I want to make sure I'm
20
   right.
21
            MS. SMITH: Are you always right?
22
            JUROR RAMBIN: No.
23
            MS. SMITH:
                        Why?
24
            JUROR RAMBIN: I don't know all the facts yet.
25
            MS. SMITH: Okay. You have to listen to all the
```

```
facts to know how it ends; is that right?
1
 2
            JUROR RAMBIN: Yes.
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, ma'am.
 3
            I saw some other hands. Who are my other CSI
 4
   watchers?
 5
 6
            Mr. Marion, have you had that same experience?
 7
            JUROR MARION: More so my wife than myself, but I
   hear a lot.
 8
            MS. SMITH: All right. So --
            JUROR MARION: I'm always in the dark.
10
11
            MS. SMITH: Fair enough.
12
            But you agree you have to hear -- and they're set
   up to the point where you have to hear all the evidence
13
   before you make up your mind.
14
15
            JUROR MARION: Yes.
16
            MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you, sir.
17
            Most of you probably see where I'm going with
18
   this, and it's played out already in the courtroom today.
19
            Mr. Ward and his team will get up, and they get to
20
   go first because their burden -- it's their burden of proof
21
   in this case.
22
            Can I have a commitment from Mr. Swilley,
23
   Mr. Moss, Ms. Howell, Mr. Crabb, Ms. Page --
24
            JUROR PYLE: Pyle.
25
            MS. SMITH: -- Mr. Page and Ms. Pyle -- can I have
```

```
a commitment that you guys will wait for all the evidence
1
 2
   before making up your mind? Hands raised.
 3
            And I see Mr. Maxie and Mr. Young are already
 4
   raising their hand.
            Ms. Vollmer, can I have that commitment from the
 5
   back row as well?
 6
 7
            Mr. Shirley, thank you.
            Ms. Strutton and Ms. Thornton?
 8
            Ms. Trammell, any problem with that? I'm going to
 9
   go to the second. You're going to wait to hear from my
10
11
   team before you make up your mind in this case?
12
            JUROR TRAMMELL: Yes.
13
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, ma'am.
            All right. Another thing I hear when I'm often
14
15
   visiting with jurors -- and I'll start with Mr. Turner on
16
   this one. And I don't like to hear this, but I need to --
   I need to visit with you about it.
17
18
            Sometimes people say, well, the Defendants are
   here; there's a bunch of documents; there's a bunch of
19
20
   lawyers; so kind of where there's smoke, there's fire.
21
   They must have done something wrong because they're all
22
   gathered here in court.
23
            How do you feel about that?
24
            JUROR TURNER: Neutral.
25
            MS. SMITH: Neutral? Okay. Thank you, sir.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Ms. Scaff, can you talk to me about that same
question? I think, we're all gathered here; where there's
smoke, there's fire; the Defendants must have done
something wrong.
        JUROR SCAFF: No, ma'am. I do not agree with
that.
        MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you, ma'am. Appreciate
that.
        Mr. Murray, how do you feel about that?
        JUROR MURRAY: I don't have a problem with that.
        MS. SMITH: Thank you, sir.
        Now, I mentioned -- I mentioned the T-Mobile
commercials, and -- and some of you, I think, have actually
had some experience with T-MO.
        Let's see. Ms. Vollmer, did I read that you had
some experience with T-Mobile in your questionnaire?
        JUROR VOLLMER: I -- I've never used them as a
cell phone provider, but we do have representatives in the
store that I work at in the electronics department, and I
talk to them a lot, and they tried to persuade me, but I
stick with AT&T.
        MS. SMITH: Okay. Well, and it's not a problem
that we haven't persuaded you yet, but anything about that
experience, as an overbearing salesman, or anything I
should know because I'm standing here today representing
```

```
T-Mobile?
1
2
            JUROR VOLLMER: No, ma'am.
            MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
3
            And, Ms. Rambin, I want to visit with you again.
 4
   Did you have some T-MO experience?
5
6
            JUROR RAMBIN: I just know people that have used
7
   it before.
            MS. SMITH: Okay. On your sheet, I want to say I
8
   remember you putting a 2 out by T-MO? Any reason for that?
10
            JUROR RAMBIN: I just heard negative, like the
11
   service wasn't good, stuff like that.
12
            MS. SMITH: You know my next question, right?
            I'm representing T-MO, and all I ask -- I don't
13
   want the advantage, but all I ask is for that flat playing
14
15
   field. Am I starting out where Mr. Ward in this case?
16
            JUROR RAMBIN: Yeah, y'all are level.
17
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, ma'am. I appreciate that.
18
            Ericsson, I don't believe -- I think Mr. Shirley
   has some Ericsson experience; is that correct?
19
20
            JUROR SHIRLEY: Uh-huh.
21
            MS. SMITH: Is that something you wanted to talk
22
   about at the bench or --
23
            JUROR SHIRLEY: That was the -- that was the
24
   question I was going to ask at the bench, and we can take
25
   it care of that.
```

```
MS. SMITH: I -- I -- if you're more comfortable
 1
 2
   at the bench, I'd be happy to visit --
            JUROR SHIRLEY: That experience was -- I just
 3
   wanted to make sure that that was not overlooked, you know,
 4
   and didn't -- you know, it got addressed. That's all I
 5
   wanted to make sure of.
 6
 7
            MS. SMITH: Okay.
 8
            JUROR SHIRLEY: That's it.
            MS. SMITH: I appreciate that, sir. Thank you.
 9
10
            All right. Let's talk a little bit about the
11
   burden of proof.
12
            Judge Gilstrap spoke with you briefly about the
13
   burden of proof, and what we're going to see in this case,
   as he said, is that the Plaintiff has a burden of proof by
14
15
   a preponderance of the evidence. And this is on
16
   infringement.
17
            What that means on the defense side, though, that
18
   means they have to pile up their evidence to try to tip
   those scales on the Plaintiff's side.
19
20
            What that means on the defense side is that we can
   do absolutely nothing. And it will probably come as no
21
22
   surprise that that's not what's going to happen in this
23
   courtroom, but we can do absolutely nothing, and we win if
24
   they don't come up with enough evidence to tip the scales.
25
            I'm going to start with Ms. Howell on this
```

```
1
   question.
2
            Were you expecting that, Ms. Howell?
3
            JUROR HOWELL: No.
            JUROR WILLEFORD: All right. How do you feel
 4
   about that? Fair? Unfair?
5
6
            JUROR HOWELL: It's an even playing field right
7
   now.
            MS. SMITH: Okay. I want to visit you -- I'm
8
   going to switch -- switch topics with you.
10
            When you were speaking earlier, I thought, man,
   I've got a little bit of this in me, but she's a champion
11
12
   of the underdog. Is that how you kind of describe
   yourself?
13
14
            JUROR HOWELL: I quess.
            MS. SMITH: Well, you said you always favored the
15
   little guy. Did you go for the Rams last night?
16
17
            JUROR HOWELL: No. Cowboys all the way.
18
            MS. SMITH: Well, okay. All right.
19
            Well, here, we have -- I mean, we have two
20
   companies suing one another. You heard Mr. Ward talk about
21
   tens of thousands of patents and dozens of lawsuits.
22
            In your mind -- and I mean, T-MO, I'm not -- you
23
   know, we're big companies. Ericsson is a large company.
24
   Are we starting out on a level playing field, though, in
25
   your mind?
```

```
JUROR HOWELL: Yes.
 1
 2
            MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
 3
            Ms. Thornton, I haven't heard from you. Good
 4
   morning.
            JUROR THORNTON: Good morning.
 5
 6
            MS. SMITH: Same kind of question for you.
7
   Plaintiff doesn't meet its burden, we can sit on our hands.
   That's one of my favorite sayings, is we can sit on our
 8
   hands and do nothing, and we win if Plaintiff doesn't meet
10
   its burden. Is that fair if that's how the Judge instructs
11
   you?
12
            JUROR THORNTON: That's fair if that's his
13
   instruction to me, yes.
14
            MS. SMITH: No hesitation. Thank you, ma'am.
15
            All right. You heard Mr. Ward say that the
   Plaintiff is asking for $77 million. And I'll tell you,
16
17
   what you're going to hear from T-MO and Ericsson is not
18
   only that we do not infringe but that we think the
19
   Plaintiff is owed zero.
            Mr. Maxie.
20
21
            JUROR MAXIE: Yes, ma'am.
22
            MS. SMITH: I haven't talked to you.
23
            What I can assure you because I -- I've been
24
   practicing here for a long time, and I know these lawyers.
25
   They're good lawyers. They're going to have a polished
```

```
presentation. They're going to give it a hundred percent.
1
2
            If they don't prove their case, though, are you
   comfortable -- and you haven't heard any of the evidence
3
   yet -- are you comfortable saying the Plaintiff gets zero?
4
            JUROR MAXIE: If they don't prove their case, yes.
 5
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, sir.
 6
7
            What about you, Ms. Vollmer? Any hesitation with
   giving the Plaintiff zero? You don't feel like, well,
8
   gosh, they worked so hard, and they put up a good fight.
10
   They deserve something.
11
            JUROR VOLLMER: I'm -- honestly, I'm not sure how
12
   to answer that question to be honest.
            MS. SMITH: It's probably because my question is
13
14
   bad. I apologize.
15
            JUROR VOLLMER: I'm just unsure of how I would
   answer that. I don't -- I don't know, honestly.
16
17
            MS. SMITH: Okay. Anything that you've heard
18
   today so far that causes you to lean towards either the
   defense or the Plaintiff's side of the case?
19
20
            JUROR VOLLMER: No, ma'am.
21
            MS. SMITH: Thank you.
22
            Mr. Turner's row, I haven't spent enough time with
23
   y'all. Is there anyone that would hesitate, if the
24
   Plaintiff doesn't prove their case by a preponderance --
25
   preponderance of the evidence, in -- in awarding Plaintiff
```

```
1
   zero?
 2
            Ms. Scaff?
            JUROR SCAFF: No, ma'am.
 3
            Ms. Rambin?
 4
 5
            Mr. Murray?
            Starting with Mr. Turner.
 6
 7
            JUROR TURNER: I have no problem with that.
            MS. SMITH: Pardon me?
 8
 9
            JUROR TURNER: I have no problem with that.
            MS. SMITH: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Turner.
10
11
            And I -- I'll tell you, your chances of getting on
12
   the panel are much greater the closer you move over.
            I don't mean to ignore the third and fourth rows.
13
   Anyone that has thoughts on that question on the third and
14
   fourth rows? Any hesitation in awarding the Plaintiff
15
16
   zero.
17
            Thank you all.
18
            All right. In this case is -- patent cases are
   super complicated at times, and they're just really
19
   complex. But in some ways, they're not any different than
20
21
   any other case.
            So we've got -- let's say we've got McDonald's hot
22
23
   coffee. Somebody spills hot coffee. They say, the coffee
24
   is too hot. And then they say, the coffee is too hot, and
25
   I have $20 million in damages. Everyone remember that
```

1 case? See some shakes of heads. 2 Okay. So McDonald's says, well, you know what? 3 First, the coffee wasn't too hot. But, second, even if the 4 coffee was too hot, we don't owe you \$20 million, fair? 5 So what's going to happen in this case is T-MO and 6 7 Ericsson are going to say, we absolutely don't infringe, and we will bring a mountain of evidence to show that. 8 But we also don't agree that this Plaintiff should get \$77 million, even if we did infringe. 10 11 So we're going to call a damage expert. My 12 question for you, Mr. Young, is, because the Defendants are bringing a damage expert and they're going to talk about 13 money, does that cause you to think, gosh, they think they 14 15 -- they think they owe something, or they must have done 16 something wrong? 17 JUROR MICHAEL YOUNG: I would expect, since we're 18 here in court, everybody is going to bring all their big 19 guns and present it to where they want to win, so... 20 MS. SMITH: Thank you, sir. 21 What about you, Mr. Page? What do you think about 22 that? Do you agree or disagree with Mr. Young? 23 JUROR PAGE: I agree with him. All of lawyers, 24 I'm sure, are confident, and we'll hear what -- you know, 25 what the evidence is, and we'll make our decisions on that.

```
1
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, sir.
 2
            Mr. Ward talked to some of you that had some
   experience in litigation.
 3
            Is there anyone on the panel that even though you
 4
   haven't been involved as maybe a plaintiff or a defendant
   in a suit, is there anyone that says, gosh, I wish I would
 6
 7
   have filed a suit? Has anyone ever have that thought.
            Mr. Page's row?
 8
 9
            Ms. Vollmer's row?
            Mr. Turner's row?
10
11
            Back?
12
            Okay. I'm going to change up the question a
   little bit.
13
14
            Mr. Swilley, we haven't talked in a while. If
15
   someone accused you of doing something that you didn't do,
16
   would you hesitate to come into court and defend yourself?
17
            JUROR SWILLEY: No, ma'am.
18
            MS. SMITH: Okay. Now, does it change anything
19
   because these are big companies?
20
            JUROR SWILLEY: No, ma'am.
21
            MS. SMITH: Do you think companies have every
22
   right to defend themselves just like you would if you were
23
   wrongfully accused?
24
            JUROR SWILLEY: Yes, ma'am.
25
            MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you, sir.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Mr. Moss, there's a case that lawyers like to talk
about, and it's called Pearson versus Chung. It's a case
where someone dropped some pants off to be altered, and
alterations kind of cost about $10.00, and there's a
satisfaction quaranteed sign in the window, and the person
isn't satisfied with the alterations and sues for a million
dollars.
        And believe it or not, people got aggravated with
the dry cleaner for defending that suit because they could
pay it and wouldn't waste anyone's time in court.
        Do you think that a company that's been wrongfully
accused has every right to come to court and defend
themselves?
        MR. WARD: Your Honor, I'm going to object.
is getting argumentative, talking about wrongly accused.
It's bringing in other cases. It's argumentative.
        THE COURT: Well, I'll overrule the objection.
The questions need to focus on gathering information.
        MS. SMITH: Understood, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: Let's proceed.
        Go ahead and answer the question, sir.
        MS. SMITH: Thank you, sir.
        JUROR MOSS: Can you ask it again?
        MS. SMITH: You know what? I'll move on for you.
        THE COURT: All right. Let's do that.
```

```
1
            MS. SMITH: Thank you.
2
            All right. I think I've got an easy one.
                                                       Who
   thinks the government can make mistakes?
3
            I'm going to ask it a different way then.
4
                                                       Who
   thinks the government cannot make a mistake?
5
6
            All right. Now, you watched the patent video
7
   earlier today. Was anyone surprised that as jurors, you
   have every ability to take away a patent? Did you all know
8
   that as jurors you could do that?
10
            Mr. Swilley, did you understand the patent system
11
   before coming in today to know that you could do that?
12
            JUROR SWILLEY: Not really, no, ma'am.
13
            MS. SMITH: Are you comfortable in that role as a
   juror deciding whether or not a patent is valid?
14
15
            JUROR SWILLEY: Yes, ma'am.
16
            MS. SMITH: What about you, Mr. Moss?
17
            JUROR MOSS: Yes, ma'am.
18
            MS. SMITH: And I'm going to go down the row.
                                                            Ιf
19
   the evidence supports invalidating a patent, are you
20
   comfortable in that role, Ms. Howell?
21
            JUROR HOWELL: Yes.
22
            MS. SMITH: Mr. Crabb?
23
            JUROR CRABB: Yes.
24
            MS. SMITH: Mr. Marion?
25
            JUROR MARION: Yes.
```

```
Thank you, sir.
1
            MS. SMITH:
2
            JUROR PYLE: Yes.
            MS. SMITH: Mr. Page?
3
            JUROR PAGE: No.
 4
            MS. SMITH: Okay. If you don't mind standing up.
5
   Tell me a little bit about why you say no.
6
7
            JUROR PAGE: Well, the people that do patents, I'm
8
   sure they do a lot of work. You know, if I come up with an
   idea and I go through all the paperwork that we saw up
   earlier in the thing, I don't think it should be so easy to
10
11
   take away something -- my ideas.
12
            MS. SMITH: Okay. And because -- because this is
   a case where you would -- you would be the one having to
13
   make that decision, do you think maybe you'd be a better
14
   fit for a different type of case?
15
16
            JUROR PAGE: Yes.
17
            MS. SMITH: Not comfortable serving in the role
18
   where you have to decide if a patent is valid or not?
19
            JUROR PAGE: Well, I mean, I'm comfortable, but I
20
   just don't -- I'd have to have a lot more information.
21
            MS. SMITH: And for that reason, you'd certainly
22
   start out leaning a little towards the company that owns
23
   the patent, which is IV?
24
            JUROR PAGE: No.
25
            MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you, sir.
```

```
Now, my question is going to change a little bit.
 1
   On Ms. Vollmer's row, does anybody agree with Mr. Page?
 2
            Ms. Strutton, I haven't heard anything from you.
 3
   I apologize for that. One way or another, how do you feel
 4
   about your role as determining whether a patent is valid or
 5
   not?
 6
 7
            JUROR STRUTTON: I would really just have to hear
   all the information before I can make my decision.
 8
            MS. SMITH: Did you have any experience with the
   Patent Office or --
10
11
            JUROR STRUTTON: No --
            MS. SMITH: -- anything of that nature before
12
13
   coming in today?
14
            JUROR STRUTTON: No.
15
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, ma'am.
            JUROR JOHNSON: I have a question.
16
17
            MS. SMITH: Ms. Johnson.
18
            JUROR JOHNSON: I thought when you did a patent,
   it's in your name.
19
20
            MS. SMITH: Yes. Yes, ma'am.
21
            JUROR JOHNSON: Because, you know, the word out
22
   here is, well, if you invent something, be sure you get it
23
   patented.
24
            So how can somebody say it's not yours if you've
   got it patented in your name or -- you know...
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MS. SMITH: I think the answer to your question,
and it's a good one -- you're spot on that the inventor's
name is on the patent. But patents are like other -- other
property. They can be bought and sold.
        JUROR JOHNSON: Oh, okay.
        MS. SMITH: So a company like IV can purchase
patents, and they're -- and that's what's happened in this
case I think you'll find.
        JUROR JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.
        MS. SMITH: Well, Ms. Johnson, I'll take it a step
further. How do you feel about that? Is that a fair
system where you can buy a patent?
        JUROR JOHNSON: Well, if -- if I invented
something and -- and I had my name on it or whatever you
do, I wouldn't want someone to steal it -- steal my ideas,
I guess, and, you know, but I don't know all the facts.
But just briefly, you know, I could answer it that way.
        MS. SMITH: But did I answer your question
sufficiently?
        JUROR JOHNSON: Yes.
        MS. SMITH: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
        Now, some people think that coming up with an idea
for something without figuring out the details is more
important than maybe the person that can make the idea
work. So you have the big idea here or you have the person
```

```
that can actually make something work.
1
            Let me go -- let me visit -- Mr. Willeford, if I
 2
   make you pick a side, either the side of just a person who
 3
 4
   has a big idea or the person who can actually make the idea
   work or put it in practice, which is more important in your
 5
   mind?
 6
 7
            JUROR WILLEFORD: I think putting it in practice.
 8
            MS. SMITH: Thank you.
            Mr. Wilgus, we haven't heard from you. Which one
 9
   is more important in your mind, if I make you pick a side?
10
11
            JUROR WILGUS: Can you repeat the question?
12
            MS. SMITH: Sure. Some people have big ideas, and
   others are able to actually implement and make something of
13
   those ideas. If you -- if you were asked to choose which
14
15
   side is more important in your mind, what would you choose?
16
            JUROR WILGUS: The people implement -- people that
   implement.
17
18
                        That implement.
            MS. SMITH:
19
            I thought when Mr. Ward was -- was visiting with
20
   people, he was talking about people that had been involved
21
   in lawsuits in one way or another, and I think I saw you
22
   raised your hand, but then I saw you take it down. Did you
23
   have any follow-up on that for me?
24
            JUROR WILGUS: It was a minor lawsuit involving a
25
   car accident --
```

```
1
            MS. SMITH: Okay.
2
            JUROR WILGUS: -- that I was in -- the Plaintiff
3
   in.
            MS. SMITH: Okay. And -- and how did that turn
4
5
   out?
6
            JUROR WILGUS: It was ruled in my favor.
7
            MS. SMITH: Okay. And because -- because you've
   been a Plaintiff in a court case before, should that cause
8
   me on the defense side to worry for any reason?
10
            JUROR WILGUS: No, ma'am.
11
            MS. SMITH: Everyone starting out on the same
12
   level playing field here?
13
            JUROR WILGUS: Yes, ma'am.
14
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Wilgus.
15
            JUROR PYLE? I do have something I thought of.
16
            MS. SMITH: All right.
17
            THE COURT: Let me just say this, ladies and
18
   gentlemen. The process is for the lawyers to ask questions
   of the panel, and the panel to respond. It's really not
19
20
   appropriate for members of the panel to ask questions. So
21
   let's go forward on that basis.
22
            MS. SMITH: May I -- may I ask Ms. Pyle if she has
   additional comments, Your Honor?
23
24
            THE COURT: You can ask her a question.
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.
25
```

```
She can't ask you a question.
 1
            THE COURT:
 2
            MS. SMITH: Understood, Your Honor.
            THE COUR:
 3
                       Okay.
 4
            MS. SMITH: Ms. Pyle --
            THE COURT: And you have five minutes left,
 5
   Ms. Smith.
 6
 7
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.
            JUROR PYLE: My husband has recently been
 8
9
   diagnosed with a rare illness -- that is, he was part of a
10
   medical, you know -- it was a drug that he was taking that
11
   actually is supposed to -- it hadn't been approved at the
12
   time. It's been approved now, but what we're learning is
13
   there's a company who has had their -- the rights to that
   this whole time, but there is another company that's much
14
15
   bigger that is trying to take over that company and charge
   patients a large amount of money for that drug.
16
17
            Well, right now, you know, we're not having to pay
18
   anything because we're part of that study. Anyway, you
   know, that he could -- you know, just hearing more and more
19
20
   about it, you know, I don't -- I do have some concerns for
21
   myself being in that situation that I could -- may -- I
22
   might have a problem with, you know, just counting on what
23
   the situation is. And like I said, I haven't heard it yet.
24
            MS. SMITH: Okay.
25
            JUROR PYLE: But, you know, I mean, I do have a
```

```
problem with a company -- you know, they have been given
1
 2
   it -- making this drug and giving it to people for free,
   and it costs them hardly nothing, but yet there's this big
 3
   company that's trying to, you know, come in and take the
 4
   rights to that company.
 5
 6
            I don't know how they're doing it. But that's
7
   what they're doing. And, you know, trying to make the big
   bucks and charge it to, you know, people like us.
 8
            So, you know, I don't -- I don't really know.
   I just -- I just had that concern at the time when you were
10
11
   just talking, so I just wanted to voice that.
12
            MS. SMITH: Well, I -- I appreciate that. And
13
   first, I'm very sorry about your husband.
            JUROR PYLE: Thank you.
14
15
            MS. SMITH: I am -- I'm having trouble -- and I --
16
   I completely understand your concerns with the pharma
17
   company that's kind of -- that's really going to impact
18
   your lives if things --
19
            JUROR PYLE: It could.
20
            MS. SMITH: I've heard tales of things like prices
21
   quadrupling and things of that nature.
22
            JUROR PYLE: Exactly.
23
            MS. SMITH: How -- applied to the two parties in
24
   this case, how would that cause you to lean in one
25
   direction or another in this case?
```

```
JUROR PYLE: Well, that's what I say. I have
1
2
   concerns, you know, because I do feel that the company that
   invented it should be the one that gets the money, not the
3
   one that, you know, has pushed it along quicker than the
4
   other one, you know, because -- I don't know. I just
5
   don't -- I don't know. I may have some concern there --
6
7
            MS. SMITH: Thank you.
            JUROR PYLE: -- as far as the -- you know --
8
9
            MS. SMITH: I appreciate your honesty.
            JUROR PYLE: Okay. Thank you.
10
11
            MS. SMITH: Thank you.
12
            Mr. Crabb?
            JUROR CRABB: Yes, ma'am.
13
            MS. SMITH: I -- when I was studying your
14
15
   questionnaire, I think you said that your mother is a legal
   secretary, is that correct, or was a legal secretary?
16
            JUROR CRABB: She used to be.
17
18
            MS. SMITH: What type of law did they practice?
19
            JUROR CRABB: Mainly civil.
20
            MS. SMITH: Civil. Any -- anything like what
   we're here talking about today?
21
22
            JUROR CRABB: Some cases, yes.
23
            MS. SMITH: Do you know if she --
24
            THE COURT: Mr. Crabb, you're going to have to
   speak up, or hold the microphone, please.
25
```

```
MS. SMITH: You have a chance to talk to her
1
2
   occasionally about her work?
3
            JUROR CRABB: Yes.
            MS. SMITH: And did she do work mostly on the
 4
   Plaintiff's side of cases or on the defense side?
5
            JUROR CRABB: As the Plaintiff.
6
7
            MS. SMITH: Okay. And what firm was she with?
8
            JUROR CRABB: Jimmy White.
9
            MS. SMITH: And where was he -- in Mt. Pleasant?
            JUROR CRABB: Mt. Pleasant.
10
11
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, sir.
12
            Mr. Ward introduced me and my firm. Has
13
   anybody -- prior to coming to court today, had you heard of
   the Ward Smith & Hill firm, Mr. Ward, Ms. Henry, Ms. Fair,
14
15
   or sitting on in the back row over there, Mr. Hill? And I
16
   say heard of, just by reputation, know any of their
17
   children, anything like that?
18
            Let's see, Ms. Trammell, we didn't give you enough
   time to fill out your questionnaire, and I apologize for
19
20
   that. Have you had any experience with -- with T-MO before
21
   coming to --
22
            JUROR TRAMMELL: No.
23
            MS. SMITH: -- court today? Okay. Had you had
24
   any experience -- did you know anyone that had ever
25
   invented anything, anything of that nature?
```

```
JUROR TRAMMELL: No, ma'am.
1
2
            MS. SMITH: Okay. Have -- have you been involved
   in any type of court activity on a Plaintiff's or a
3
   Defendant's side?
4
            JUROR TRAMMELL: No.
5
6
            MS. SMITH: I was just asking the questions from
7
   the second page that you didn't quite get to. Thank you,
   ma'am.
8
            THE COURT: You've got about 15 seconds, counsel.
            MS. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.
10
11
            The last question, the same as Mr. Ward. When I
12
   walk into these -- these conversations, I try to think of
   every question I can, but I obviously don't get them all
13
14
   right.
            Is there anybody sitting there right now that
15
   thinks, gosh, if she would have just asked me this
16
17
   question, I'd be able to tell her that I'm not the best fit
18
   for this panel?
19
            All right. Thank you all. On behalf of T-MO and
20
   Ericsson, thank you for your time this morning.
21
            THE COURT: All right. Counsel, approach the
22
   bench, please.
23
            (Bench conference.)
24
            THE COURT: All right. I have Mr. Swilley having
25
   a potential scheduling problem. And I have Mr. Murray
```

```
having a potential scheduling problem. And Ms. Young,
1
2
   No. 24, having a potential scheduling problem.
            Does Plaintiff have any challenges for cause?
3
            MR. WARD: We do, Your Honor. Juror No. 2.
 4
            THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Pyle?
 5
            MR. WARD: Yes, sir. She said --
 6
7
            THE COURT: Anyone else?
            MR. WARD: No. Jurors No. 11 and 20 indicated
8
   there's something they wanted to talk about at the bench.
9
10
            THE COURT: Well, I think Mr. Shirley, No. 11,
11
   just wanted to make sure that his experience with Ericsson
12
   was noted, but I'll bring him up here and confirm that.
   I'm not sure --
13
            MR. WARD: Yeah, I don't know what he wanted to
14
15
   say about Ericsson. That's why I didn't ask him in
16
   front -- and then 20, just -- he said he had something that
   he wanted to take up at the bench.
17
18
            THE COURT: I'm aware of that. But you have the
   one challenge for cause?
19
20
            MR. WARD: Yes, sir.
21
            THE COURT: Do Defendants have any challenges for
22
   cause?
23
            MS. SMITH: You challenged Pyle; is that's
24
   correct, Mr. Ward?
25
           MR. WARD: Yes.
```

```
We don't object to that challenge.
 1
            MS. SMITH:
 2
            THE COURT: All right.
            MS. SMITH: And then we have Mr. Page and
 3
   Mr. Shirlev.
 4
                      Mr. Page and Shirley for cause?
 5
            MR. WARD:
            MS. SMITH: I didn't object to Ms. Pyle.
 6
 7
            MR. WARD:
                      I'm saying are you challenging?
            MS. SMITH: Yeah.
 8
 9
            MR. WARD:
                       One?
10
            MS. SMITH: Ms. Page.
11
            THE COURT: One and 11 is what I have, Defendants
12
   being challenged for cause.
13
            MR. WARD: We have no objection.
14
            MS. SMITH: Okay.
15
            THE COURT: You don't object to those challenges?
16
            MR. WARD: We don't object to those challenges.
17
            THE COURT: So without objection, one is excused,
18
   2 is excused, and 11 is excused. And since he's excused,
   there's really no need to bring him up here.
19
20
            MR. WARD: Correct.
21
            THE COURT: Now, let me ask you this, counsel.
22
   No. 14, Ms. Trammell or Trammell, she slept through most of
23
   your examination, and I listened to her snore for over five
24
   minutes.
25
            MS. SMITH:
                        I agree.
```

```
1
            THE COURT: I have some concerns about her ability
 2
   to serve.
 3
            MS. SMITH: I agree.
            THE COURT: My intention was to bring her to the
 4
   bench and ask her about her ability to be alert and stay
 5
   awake.
 6
 7
            MR. WARD: I think we'd like to at least question
   her, see if there's something going on.
 8
            THE COURT: Anybody have a problem with me
   bringing her to the bench?
10
11
            MS. SMITH: No, Your Honor.
12
            MR. WARD: No.
13
            THE COURT: Okay. Then I'll bring her up.
            So I have four people that need to come to the
14
15
   bench and visit with the Court and with the parties No. 7,
   Mr. Swilley, about his schedule; No. 14, Ms. Trammell;
16
17
   No. 18, Mr. Murray; No. 20, Mr. Wilgus; and No. 24,
18
   Ms. Young.
19
            Does anybody have anybody else that I've not
20
   mentioned?
21
            MR. WARD: No.
22
            MS. SMITH: No, Your Honor.
23
            THE COURT: Okay. All right. If you all will
24
   return to your seats, I'll excuse the rest of the panel,
25
   and then we'll bring these up one at a time.
```

1 MS. SMITH: Thank you. 2 (Bench conference concluded.) THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm about to 3 excuse most of you for a break -- for a short recess. 4 There are a few of you that I'm going to ask to 5 stay in your seats, and then when the rest of the panel is 6 7 outside the courtroom on recess, I'm going to ask each of you to come up one at a time, and visit with me here at the 8 bench. 10 Those members of the panel that I'm going to ask 11 to stay behind -- and if you'll just let those close to you 12 slip out and go around you and stay at your respective seat where you are -- those are No. 7, Mr. Swilley; No. 14, 13 Ms. Trammell; No. 18, Mr. Murray; No. 20, Mr. Wilgus; and 14 15 No. 24, Ms. Young. 16 Everyone else I'm going to excuse for a recess. And before you leave, ladies and gentlemen, let me mention 17 18 this to you. I'm going to ask that you exit through the double doors in the back of the courtroom, and if you take 19 20 a left going out those doors, you'll find two very important things: The water fountains and the restrooms. 21 22 I'm going to ask you to stay in the building. 23 I ask that you not leave the courthouse. I don't expect 24 that this will be a lengthy recess, but I'd like to keep 25 you close at hand.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Also, ladies and gentlemen, while you're on
recess, do not discuss anything that's happened in the
courtroom this morning.
        Let me remind all of you, you have heard no
evidence in this case. What the lawyers tell the members
of the panel and tell the jury that's actually selected is
not evidence in this case.
        So talk about the Super Bowl if you can't think of
anything else better to talk about or talk about the
weather or your grandchildren or anything else you'd like
to, but don't talk about, while you're on recess, anything
that's happened in the courtroom this morning.
        So with that, except for those individual members
I asked to stay behind, the remainder of the panel is
excused at this time.
        COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
        THE COURT: Mr. Moss, if you'll just kind of lead
the way, please.
        (Venire panel out.)
        THE COURT: All right. Please be seated.
        Counsel, approach the bench, please.
        (Bench conference.)
        THE COURT: Before I bring Mr. Swilley up, I want
to confirm again for clarity on the record, Defendants
challenged No. 1, Mr. Page, and No. 11, Mr. Swilley, for
```

```
cause, and Plaintiff did not object to that challenge.
1
            MR. WARD: That's correct.
 2
 3
            THE COURT: And Defendant -- excuse me --
   Plaintiff challenged No. 2, Ms. Pyle, for cause, and
 4
   Defendant did not object to that challenge.
 5
            MS. SMITH: That's correct, Your Honor.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: So by agreement of the parties, those
   three members of the panel are excused.
 8
            All right. I'll bring up Mr. Swilley, and we'll
   see what his scheduling issue is.
10
11
            (Open court.)
12
            THE COURT: Mr. Swilley, would you come up,
13
   please, sir?
14
            (Bench conference continued.)
15
            THE COURT: Morning, sir.
            JUROR SWILLEY: Morning.
16
17
            THE COURT: How are you?
18
            JUROR SWILLEY: Good.
19
            THE COURT: You -- this is a microphone. You and
20
   I are just going to talk quietly here.
21
            You indicated that you might have difficulty being
22
   here all week if you were selected to serve. Tell me about
23
   that.
24
            JUROR SWILLEY: I just -- I'm a small oil and gas
25
   business, and I live off my phone, and I work -- I answer
```

```
my phone -- like this morning, it started at 1:00, phone
1
 2
   calls, and I just never know -- I mean, day-by-day,
   hour-by-hour and --
 3
            THE COURT: And remind me, are you self-employed
 4
 5
   or --
            JUROR SWILLEY: Yes, sir.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: You work for yourself?
 8
            JUROR SWILLEY: Yes, sir.
 9
            THE COURT: And do you have people that work with
   you that could cover the business while you're not there?
10
11
            JUROR SWILLEY: I've just got three guys, and like
   two of them are out today, and we just never know.
12
            And then I can't hardly transfer my phone because
13
   like today they're down there south of Mansfield and don't
14
15
   have good phone service.
            So I would love -- I mean, this is a pretty
16
   interesting case, I believe, but that's just my biggest
17
18
   problem.
19
            THE COURT: All right.
20
            JUROR SWILLEY: Small business owner.
21
            THE COURT: Mr. Ward, do you have any questions of
22
   Mr. Swilley?
23
            MR. WARD: I do not.
24
            THE COURT: Ms. Smith?
25
            MS. SMITH: No, Your Honor.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
THE COURT: Mr. Swilley, I'm going to let you join
the rest of the panel outside for recess. Just don't talk
about anything we talked about in here.
        JUROR SWILLEY: Okay.
        THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
        (Juror Swilley leaves the courtroom.)
        THE COURT: Mr. Swilley's situation is one that
comes up regularly, and I'm sympathetic to self-employed
individuals, but they also are citizens of our country, and
they owe a duty to serve just like somebody that's employed
by somebody else.
        I didn't hear anything from him that makes me
believe he must be excused. Do either Plaintiff or
Defendant have anything to add with regard to Mr. Swilley?
        MR. WARD: Nothing from the Plaintiff.
        MS. SMITH: No, Your Honor.
        THE COURT: All right. I'm not going to excuse
Mr. Swilley.
        (Open court.)
        THE COURT: Ms. Trammell, would you come up,
please?
        (Bench conference continued.)
        THE COURT: Good morning, ma'am.
        JUROR TRAMMELL: Good morning.
        THE COURT: This is our microphone. You and I are
```

```
just going to talk quietly up here.
1
2
            JUROR TRAMMELL: Okay.
            THE COURT: Ms. Trammell, during the questioning
3
4
   of the panel today, you may not know this, but you, at
   least twice, went to sleep. One of the times I heard you
5
   snore for about five minutes.
6
7
            Is there something about your physical condition
   that would make it hard for you to be alert and awake
8
   throughout a long trial?
10
            JUROR TRAMMELL: I know when I sit for a long
   period of time or if I'm a passenger in someone's car --
11
12
            THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
13
            JUROR TRAMMELL: -- I doze off to sleep, but I
14
   don't be trying to.
15
            THE COURT: Oh, I know that.
16
            JUROR TRAMMELL: But I think it's some of the
   medicine that's I be taking that makes me do this.
17
18
            THE COURT: Let me ask you this:
                                               If you were
   selected to serve on this jury, there are going to be
19
20
   periods of time of up to an hour and a half, sometimes as
21
   long as two hours without taking a break.
22
            Do you think, if you were required to sit still in
23
   a chair and listen for as long as two hours at a time, that
24
   you could stay awake and be alert?
25
            JUROR TRAMMELL: No, sir.
```

```
THE COURT: Okay. Well, there's nothing to be
1
2
   ashamed about. We all have our challenges.
3
             I just observed that while these questions were
   going on. And it doesn't do either the Plaintiff or the
4
   Defendant or the Court any good if we've got folks on the
5
   jury that aren't able to be alert and listen and take in
6
7
   all the evidence.
8
            JUROR TRAMMELL: Yes, sir.
9
            THE COURT: Okay. Do either the Plaintiff or
   Defendant have any questions of Ms. Trammell?
10
11
            Mr. Ward?
12
            MR. WARD: Nothing from the Plaintiff.
            THE COURT: Ms. Smith?
13
            MS. SMITH: No, Your Honor.
14
15
            THE COURT: Well, Ms. Trammell, based on what
   you've told me about your physical condition, I'm going to
16
17
   excuse you from service on the jury.
18
            Now, I want you to go out and be with the rest of
19
   the group on recess, and I don't want you to mention
20
   anything about it, but when the jury is called, your name
21
   won't be called, and I'll release you after that's done,
22
   okay?
23
            JUROR TRAMMELL: Yes, sir.
24
            THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.
25
            JUROR TRAMMELL: Thank you.
```

```
(Juror Trammell leaves the courtroom.)
 1
 2
            THE COURT: I'm going to excuse Ms. Trammell based
   on her physical limitations to stay alert throughout the
 3
 4
   jury trial process.
 5
            (Open court.)
            THE COURT: Mr. Murray, would you come up, please?
 6
 7
            (Bench conference continued.)
 8
            THE COURT: Good morning, sir.
 9
            JUROR MURRAY: Good morning.
            THE COURT: This is our microphone. You and I are
10
11
   just going to talk quietly here.
12
            JUROR MURRAY: Okay.
13
            THE COURT: You indicated you might have a
   difficult time being present all week if you were selected.
14
15
   Can you tell me about that.
16
            JUROR MURRAY: My wife had surgery on her shoulder
   Thursday and complications Friday. We were in Dallas.
17
18
            Anyway, I got her back home, but she needs my
19
   assistance to get dressed and fix things to eat, and I've
20
   got to take her back to Dallas Thursday.
21
            THE COURT: She has a follow-up appointment on
22
   Thursday?
23
            JUROR MURRAY: With the surgeon, yes, sir.
24
            THE COURT: Okay. And I assume there's nobody
   else living in the home who can take care of that for you?
25
```

```
JUROR MURRAY: No. All my kids are in South
1
2
   Louisiana. My stepdaughter is in Dallas. And there's one
   here, but she's in school right now.
3
            THE COURT: Okay. So there's nobody that could
4
   step in and fill in for you if you were on the jury.
5
   That's what you're telling me.
6
7
            JUROR MURRAY: Not full time, no, sir.
            THE COURT: And not anybody that could take her
8
   back to Dallas for her follow-up?
10
            JUROR MURRAY: Not that I know of right now.
11
            THE COURT: Okay.
12
            JUROR MURRAY: It's mainly getting her dressed and
13
   feeding her.
14
            THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ward, do you have any
15
   questions of Mr. Murray?
16
            MR. WARD: No questions.
17
            THE COURT: Ms. Smith?
18
            MS. SMITH: No, Your Honor.
19
            THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Murray, I'm going to let
20
   you join the rest of the group outside. Just don't discuss
21
   anything we've talked about here.
22
            JUROR MURRAY: Okay.
23
            THE COURT: Thank you, sir.
24
            (Juror Murray leaves the courtroom.)
25
            THE COURT: I'm going to excuse Mr. Murray.
```

```
MR. WARD: You did?
1
2
            THE COURT: I am going to excuse Mr. Murray.
 3
            MR. WARD: Okay.
            THE COURT: Particularly, because his wife has a
 4
   follow-up appointment, and there's nobody else to get her
5
   back to Dallas, and they live alone. I think those are
6
7
   extenuating enough circumstances.
            MR. WARD: I agree. I just didn't hear you. I'm
8
   sorry, Your Honor.
9
10
            THE COURT: All right. Next is Mr. Wilgus.
11
            (Open court.)
12
            THE COURT: Mr. Wilgus, would you come up, please?
            (Bench conference continued.)
13
            THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Wilgus.
14
15
            JUROR WILGUS: Good morning.
            THE COURT: This is our microphone. You and I are
16
   just going to talk quietly here.
17
18
            During the process of the lawyers addressing the
   panel this morning, you indicated there might be something
19
20
   you wanted to visit with me at the bench about.
21
            JUROR WILGUS: Yes, sir.
22
            THE COURT: I have no idea what that is, but I'm
23
   happy to hear from you.
24
            JUROR WILGUS: A few years back, there was an
   instance where I had purchased a T-Mobile device, and it
25
```

```
stated it was a 30-day quarantee. I returned the device
1
 2
   within 30 days and did not receive my money back.
 3
            So being that -- that said, I don't know that I
   could render a fair or impartial judgment --
 4
            THE COURT: Is that --
 5
            JUROR WILGUS: -- for T-Mobile.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: Is that experience something that
   you're concerned might keep you from being fair and
 8
   impartial?
10
            JUROR WILGUS: Yes, sir, it is.
11
            THE COURT: I assume you bought that from a
12
   T-Mobile store?
            JUROR WILGUS: Yes, sir, that's correct.
13
            THE COURT: Okay. Well, only you, Mr. Wilgus,
14
15
   know if you can put that or any other experience out of
16
   your mind and treat both of these parties fairly, and if
17
   you can't do it, now is the time.
18
            Mr. Ward, do you have any questions of Mr. Wilgus?
19
            MR. WARD: Yeah. My question is: Do you start
20
   out leaning one way or the other before you've heard any of
21
   the evidence?
22
            This case is obviously not about guarantees on
23
   phones, but if that's something that's going to cause
24
   you --
25
            JUROR WILGUS: I understand.
```

```
MR. WARD: -- if that's going to cause you to
1
2
   lean, this is the time to tell us or tell us if you can set
   it aside.
3
            JUROR WILGUS: Being that T-Mobile is being
4
   represented here and I think they still owe me money for
   abiding by their contracts, I don't feel that I can render
6
7
   a fair and impartial judgment.
            THE COURT: Okay. All right. Ms. Smith, do you
8
   have any questions?
10
            MS. SMITH: No, Your Honor.
11
            THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Wilgus, I appreciate your
12
   candor. I'm going to let you join the rest of the panel
   outside.
13
14
            JUROR WILGUS: Okay.
15
            THE COURT: Just don't discuss anything that we've
16
   talked about here.
17
            JUROR WILGUS: Yes, sir.
            THE COURT: Thank you.
18
19
            (Juror Wilgus leaves the courtroom.)
20
            THE COURT: I'm going to excuse Mr. Wilgus.
21
            (Open court.)
22
            THE COURT: Ms. Young, would you come up, please?
23
            (Bench conference continued.)
24
            THE COURT: Are we going to get to her? We may
25
        Well, we may.
   not.
```

```
Good morning, ma'am. This is our microphone.
1
2
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: Okay.
3
            THE COURT: And you and I are just going to talk
   quietly here.
4
5
            When we started this morning, I asked if anyone
   might have a difficult time being present all week if they
6
7
   were selected. You raised your hand.
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: Yes.
8
9
            THE COURT: Tell me about that.
10
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: My youngest son is scheduled to
   have surgery on Monday of next week, so we have pre-op and
11
12
   follow-up doctor appointments and things at the end of this
   week.
13
            THE COURT: Okay. Where are all those pre-op and
14
15
   follow-up appointments going to be?
16
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: In Mount Pleasant.
17
            THE COURT: All right. And am I correct you live
18
   in Pittsburg?
19
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: Yes.
20
            THE COURT: Okay. And where is the surgery
   scheduled for Monday of next week?
21
22
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: Mount Pleasant.
23
            THE COURT: Okay. And how old is he?
24
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: 12.
25
            THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Ward, do you have any
```

```
questions of Ms. Young?
1
2
            MR. WARD: I do not.
3
            THE COURT: Ms. Smith?
            MS. SMITH: No, Your Honor.
 4
            THE COURT: I gather, Ms. Young -- I understand
5
6
   you're his mother --
7
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: Yes.
            THE COURT: -- but I just have to ask, I assume
8
   there's not someone else, a parent or a grandparent that
   could step in and do those things if you were here on jury
10
   duty?
11
12
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: His daddy and I are having to
   take turns taking off work. He's been out of school a
13
14
   lot --
15
            THE COURT: Okay.
16
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: -- for being sick.
17
            THE COURT: And I assume this is not cosmetic or
18
   minor surgery?
19
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: No, no.
20
            THE COURT: I'm going to let you join the rest of
21
   the group outside. Just don't discuss anything we've
22
   talked about in here.
23
            JUROR AMY YOUNG: Okay.
24
            THE COURT: Thank you.
25
            (Juror excused from courtroom.)
```

```
THE COURT: All right. I'm going to excuse
1
 2
   Ms. Young.
 3
            That means No. 1 has been excused for cause
   without objection.
 4
            No. 2 has been excused for cause without
 5
   objection.
 6
7
            No. 11 has been excused for cause without
 8
   objection.
            No. 14 has been excused by the Court based on her
   physical limitations.
10
11
            No. 18 has been excused based on personal
12
   scheduling issues.
13
            No. 20 has been excused based on his professed
   inability to be fair and impartial between the parties.
14
            And No. 24 has been excused by the Court based on
15
   her son's surgery and her scheduling challenges.
16
17
            That means one, two, three, four, five, six, seven
18
   have been excused.
19
            Eight jurors will be seated. Each side has four
   challenges. Eight and 16 is 24. So does that get us to
20
21
   No. 25 or through 25?
22
            MR. WARD: I misunderstood. Did you say that you
23
   did excuse Juror No. 7, or you did not?
            THE COURT: I did not.
24
25
            MR. WARD: You did not, okay.
```

```
THE COURT: No. I'm sympathetic to his situation,
1
 2
   but his obligations as a citizen are no different than
 3
   someone who is not self-employed.
            MR. WARD: Yes, sir.
 4
            THE COURT: And I can't allow that to be a
 5
   controlling reason.
 6
7
            So 1 is excused, 2 is excused, 11 is excused, 14
   is excused, 18 is excused, 20 and 24 are excused.
 8
            So from those are -- are left, each side will
   exercise four challenges, and the first eight remaining
10
11
   will be our jury.
12
            MR. WARD: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: How long do y'all need to strike your
13
14
   lists?
15
            MS. SMITH: 15 minutes.
16
            MR. WARD: 15 minutes.
17
            THE COURT: All right. 25 minutes until 12:00.
18
   Please have your back --- your strike lists back to the
19
   courtroom deputy.
20
            MR. WARD: Thank you.
21
            MS. SMITH: Thank you.
22
            (Bench conference concluded.)
23
            THE COURT: All right. While counsel exercise
24
   their peremptory challenges, the Court will stand in
25
   recess.
```

```
COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
 1
 2
            (Recess.)
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
 3
 4
            THE COURT: Be seated, please.
            All right. Ladies and gentlemen, if you will
 5
   listen carefully, when your name is called, come forward
 6
7
   and take your place in the jury box.
 8
            Before the names are actually called, I'd like to
   cover one thing with you. We're going to seat eight jurors
 9
   in this case, and I'd like the first four positioned on the
10
11
   front of row of the jury box and the second four of our
12
   jurors, four, five -- no, five, six, seven, and eight, on
13
   the second row of the jury box.
            If the first person called will walk down the
14
15
   aisle in the front row, the first row of the jury box and
   stand in front of the chair that leaves two empty chairs
16
   beyond you.
17
18
            The third chair from the end is where Juror No. 1
   should stand. That will leave two empty chairs beyond
19
20
   them. That will basically put the first four jurors in the
   middle of that row, and the second four jurors will stack
21
22
   up on the second row behind the jurors on the front row.
23
   That will leave our eight member jury centered in the jury
24
   box for purposes of the trial.
25
            And if all eight members of the jury will stand
```

```
until everyone is in place, then I'll seat the jury at
1
   once.
 2
            So with those instructions, I'll ask our courtroom
 3
   deputy, Ms. Lockhart, to call the names of the eight
 4
   members of the panel that have been selected as jurors in
 5
   this case.
 6
 7
            COURTROOM DEPUTY: Martin Crabb, John Moss,
   Shannon Swilley, Amber Vollmer, Michael Young, Melissa
 8
   Strutton, Susan Thornton, and Mary Rambin.
            THE COURT: Please be seated, ladies and
10
11
   gentlemen.
12
            All of you on the panel that were not selected to
   serve as members of the jury in this case, I'm about to
13
   excuse you, but I want to excuse you with the thanks and
14
15
   appreciation of the Court, the Court staff, and I'm quite
16
   confident the lawyers and the parties in this case also
   appreciate your presence here this morning.
17
18
            Ladies and gentlemen, let me say this. Every one
   of you had other places you needed to be this morning,
19
20
   other things you needed to do, and you set those other
21
   responsibilities and obligations aside, and you appeared
22
   for jury service in this case.
23
            You presented yourself as you were summoned to do
24
   by the Court, and you participated fully. Even though you
25
   weren't selected to serve on the jury, each of you have
```

performed very real and important public service.

The Court could not do what it's obligated and charged to do under our Constitution without ordinary citizens being willing to make the sacrifice -- and that's what you've done -- to be here this morning, to present yourself for jury duty, and to serve when selected. Though you weren't selected, you have done something very significant and very important today.

The Court recognizes it, the Court thanks you for it, and I'm confident that everyone on this side of the bar out there joins me in thanking you for being here.

When you get ready to leave or when you leave in just a moment, if you will make sure that you see that the clerk's office recovers from you those very expensive juror labels and those high-dollar numbers that you have clipped on your clothing. Don't take those home with you.

If you need anything as far as a written acknowledgement for your employer where you've been today, the clerk's office and their staff will be more than happy to accommodate you. If you have any questions about your service this morning, the clerk's office will handle those for you.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for being here.

Thank you for the service that you've rendered. And with that, those not selected on the jury are excused at this

```
time and are free to leave.
1
 2
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
            (Jury panel out.)
 3
            THE COURT: All right. Be seated -- everyone but
 4
   the jury. If the jury will remain standing. I'm going to
 5
   ask our courtroom deputy, Ms. Lockhart, to administer the
 6
7
   oath to the jury at this time.
 8
            (Jurors sworn.)
            THE COURT: Now, be seated. Thank you.
 9
            Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I'm about to
10
11
   excuse you in a moment for lunch.
12
            Now that you are our jury in this case, the
13
   government will provide your lunch each day. You do not
   need to worry about bringing lunch or finding a place to
14
15
   eat or leaving the courthouse.
16
            It will be brought to you in the jury room each
   day while you're serving here on jury duty.
17
18
            Also, so you'll know, it's my practice to start
   each morning about 8:30, so I'm going to ask you beginning
19
20
   tomorrow morning, try to be in the jury room and assembled
21
   to go not later than about 8:15 or 8:20, and we'll try to
22
   start here in the courtroom as close to 8:30 as possible.
23
            While I'm giving you some guidelines on
24
   scheduling, it's difficult to tell you when we'll stop each
25
   day.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Some of the witnesses that you're going to hear in this case will probably be on the witness stand 10 minutes. Some of them are going to be on the witness stand an hour and a half or two hours, it just depends. And the Court likes to avoid stopping a witness in the middle of their testimony if at all possible. I try every way I can to make the information that's going to be presented to you as unbroken and as straightforward as possible because I think it's important for you to do what you're required to do. So when we get toward the end of the day, 5:00 or 5:30, you will probably still be going. It's going to depend on where we are. If we have just finished a long witness and there's another one to start, that will probably be a good place to stop for the day. If we still have 30 minutes to go to get this particular witness off the witness stand, we may stay and get that witness finished. So it's much more of an estimate as far as when we may end for the end of the day. I rarely stop by 5:00 o'clock. So somewhere between 5:00 and 6:00 is a good guess for your travel plans going to your homes and being there at night. But we will do our best to start about 8:30 in the morning. I'll also try to take a 10 or sometimes up to

15-minute break in the morning before lunch. And I usually 1 2 try to take two such recesses in the afternoon. So I will try to see that you're not required to 3 sit still and listen more than about an hour and a half at 4 a time if at all possible. It may go over that a little 5 bit, but that's what I target to try and look for a good 6 7 time to recess during the course of the trial. That's just for your information. 8 Also, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to ask you, 9 when you come back from lunch, to make sure that any cell 10 11 phones or electronic devices that you have stay in the jury 12 room. Don't bring them back in the courtroom. 13 And I'm going to ask, starting tomorrow morning, either leave your cell phones and electronic devices at 14 home or leave them in your automobiles. 15 If you need to check a phone for business purposes 16 during the lunch break, you'll have an opportunity to go to 17 18 your vehicle if you need to do that, but it's important that you not bring those devices back into the courtroom. 19 20 The lawyers in the case are entitled to use 21 electronic devices. Nowadays, it's part of the tools of 22 the trade, but they're required to keep them on silent. 23 And they understand that the Court will take it 24 very seriously if any of their devices ring or interrupt or

25

disrupt the trial process.

So we don't have that risk with you, I'm going to ask that you not bring them.

Also, ladies and gentlemen, one of the things I'm going to tell you about is that I have several instructions for you. One of the instructions is that you're not supposed to do any research about this case from any source.

And cell phones are just a small computer you carry in your pocket or in your purse. And if it's in the jury room with you, there's a temptation to Google this or check that, and that's not what's supposed to happen.

So just to remove any temptation, either leave your electronic devices at home, or leave them in your automobiles when you come tomorrow. And for this afternoon, if you've got them with you, leave them in the jury room, please.

Also, ladies and gentlemen, included in these instructions I need to give you is this. Do not communicate with anybody about this case.

It's an absolutely fundamental -- fundamental principle that when all the evidence is presented in a trial like this, at that point, I will give you my final instructions on the law, the lawyers will present their closing arguments, and at that point, I will direct you to retire to the jury room and to deliberate on your verdict.

The verdict is a form that I will give you, and it will contain several questions in it that the jury has to answer. And those answers to the questions from the jury will have to be unanimous.

It is essential that when you get to that point of going to the jury room and deliberating on your verdict, after you've heard all the evidence, that the only information that you have to draw on to answer those questions are the sworn testimony of the witnesses that have been heard in open court under oath subject to cross-examination and the documents that the Court has scrutinized for their admissibility and which have been admitted as exhibits in the trial.

Those two things are the only evidence in this case. And it is essential that when you make your unanimous decisions about the questions in the verdict form, that all you have before you and all you have to draw upon is that evidence, sworn testimony in open court and the exhibits that have been admitted through the trial process.

Therefore, it is absolutely essential that you not communicate with anyone in any way about this case. And when I say don't communicate, I mean that in the broadest sense of the word.

If any of you are users of social media, that

means don't post something on Facebook, don't tweet or

Twitter, don't use Instagram or any of the other myriad of

social media platforms that are out there.

Also, I can tell you this. When we're through today and you go home, unless you live alone, when you walk through the door, wherever that is, the first thing whoever lives there with you is going to say is, well, tell me what happened in federal court in Marshall today.

Don't even try to answer that question because if you even try to answer it, you almost assuredly violate the instruction that I'm giving you. Just blame it on me. Say that very stern Federal Judge told me not to talk about the case, and he told me after the jury trial was over and I had been released, I could talk about it then, but before then, I can't talk about it at all. Just blame it on me.

Also, when I say don't communicate, that means between the eight of you. Until you've heard all the evidence and until I've directed you to retire to the jury room and consider and deliberate on your verdict, you must not discuss the case even among the eight of you.

Now, at the point when you've heard all the evidence and at the point when you retire to the jury room to consider and deliberate on the verdict and reach unanimous answers to the questions in that verdict form, then it becomes your duty to discuss the evidence and the

1 case among the eight of yourselves.

But until that time, you must not discuss the case with anyone, including the eight of you, and you must not communicate about the case in any way.

Also, you're -- you're not to do any research about this case. And that's the reason I'm going to ask you to leave your electronic devices outside the courtroom starting tomorrow.

You're not to Google anything. You're not to check on any of these lawyers. You're not to pull up anything on any of these parties. You're not to do any research of any kind.

Also, ladies and gentlemen, one other thing I need to mention to you, and I don't think it's likely, but this is an important case, and there's a lot at stake. And there are no unimportant, insignificant cases that make it to a jury trial in federal court.

Consequently, it's within the realm of possibility that some third party may try to approach you while you're serving as jurors and influence you about your decision in this case. I don't think that's likely, but I can't tell you that it's outside the realm of possibility.

If at any point before I discharged you as jurors you feel that you've been inappropriately contacted or communicated with by anybody, then you should immediately

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

inform Ms. Clendening, the clerk. She will let me know, and the Court will deal with it. Again, it's not likely, but this is an important case, and you need to know that it is at least possible. Finally, ladies and gentlemen, during the course of this trial, you'll be coming in in the mornings and leaving in the evenings, you'll have breaks and recesses and lunch breaks. This is a small building, as federal courthouses go. And there's a likelihood, probably a good likelihood that at some point, either on the front steps or in the hall way, somewhere, you will pass one or more of these lawyers, you will pass one or more of the witnesses, you will pass some of the support team that's here to support one side or the other in this case. None of those people are going to talk to you. If they walk right by you and you smile at them, they're not going to say good morning. They're not going to say how are you today? They're not going to be friendly and outgoing and gregarious, as is the usual manner here in East Texas. That, again, is because the only information, the only communication, the only universe of things for you to draw upon in answering the ultimate questions in this case

must only come from the sworn testimony given in this trial

and the admitted exhibits in this trial. 1 2 So the lawyers and all those other parties are not going to talk with you. And when that happens and you 3 smile at them and they walk right by you, don't think 4 they're being rude or unfriendly or mean. Don't hold it 5 against them. 6 7 Understand they are doing what the Court requires 8 of them, and it's for that purpose. And it's important that you understand that. 9 10 Now, with those instructions, ladies and 11 gentlemen, I'm going to excuse you so that you may go to 12 the jury room and have your lunch. It's almost 10 minutes after 12:00. There are a couple matters I need to take up 13 with the lawyers outside of your presence before we 14 continue after lunch. 15 16 So I'm going to attempt to bring you back in and start again approximately at 1:15. And it may be -- you 17 18 may be flexible -- you may have to be flexible me. It mav be a little one way or the other, but I'm going to shoot 19 20 for approximately 1:15 to have you back from lunch and begin again. 21 22 With those instructions, ladies and gentlemen, 23 including the one not to communicate with anybody about 24 this case -- and let me just, by the way, tell you right 25 now.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
You're going to hear that from me just about every
time you get up out of those chairs. It's so essential and
so fundamental, and we risk the entirety of this whole
process if that were to be violated.
        So because of that reason, just about every time
you stand up and leave the jury box, you're going to hear
me say, remember, ladies and gentlemen, don't communicate
or discuss the case with anyone. You're going to be tired
of hearing that from me by the time this trial is over, but
I'm going to repeat it over and over again because it is so
fundamental and essential, and I want to remind you of it
every chance I get.
        So with all those instructions, your lunch should
be waiting for you in the jury room. And with that, the
jury is excused for lunch at this time.
        COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
        (Jury out.)
        THE COURT: Be seated, please.
        As counsel is well aware, there was a question
raised during the last day of pre-trial in this case about
the issue related to patentability and Section 101.
I indicated I would give you direction on that
subsequently.
        I issued an order yesterday directing additional
briefing on that issue. I've received and reviewed that
```

```
briefing that the parties have filed.
1
2
            And at this point, I will afford each side a very
   short argument in support of their briefing if they care to
3
   make it before I take up the 101 issue.
4
            This is the moving Defendants that would urge the
5
   101 issue, so let me ask Defendants, do you have any brief
6
7
   argument in support of your briefing on this matter?
            MR. KUBEHL: We do, Your Honor. Mr. Harrison Rich
8
   will argue for the Defendants.
9
10
            THE COURT: All right. Mr. Rich, you may proceed
11
   with your argument.
12
            MR. RICH: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: Good afternoon.
13
            MR. RICH: May I approach with a few short slides?
14
15
            THE COURT: You may, and I hope the slides are
16
   short.
17
            MR. RICH: I'll make them short.
18
            THE COURT: I don't have -- I don't have more than
   about 10 or 12 minutes a side to do this.
19
20
            MR. RICH: All right. I'll be very brief.
21
            THE COURT: Let me hear from you. Go ahead.
            MR. RICH: So, Your Honor, Harrison Rich on behalf
22
23
   of the T-Mobile Defendants. I'll be presenting the
24
   arguments of patent eligibility of two patents -- two of
25
   the three patents in this case, the '206 patent and the
```

```
1
    '629 patent.
 2
            And I'll start with the '206 patent where we're
   challenging all six of IV's asserted claims. Those claims
 3
   include Claims 109 -- it's an independent claim -- and
 4
   Dependent Claims 112, 118, 140, 144, and 146.
 5
 6
            And I'll briefly give a little procedural
7
   background. We originally moved to dismiss Claim 109 at
 8
   the Rule 12 stage.
            THE COURT: And the Court's ruled on that.
            MR. RICH: The Court denied that motion. And at
10
11
   that point there were two procedural safeguards in place.
12
            The Court had to accept the patent specification
   statements as true and couldn't consider evidence outside
13
   the pleadings.
14
            So in applying those safeguards, the Court
15
16
   reasoned that Claim 109 provided a technological solution
   to a technical problem and cited to the specification.
17
18
            With those safequards no longer in play, the Court
19
   can now consider evidence outside of the pleading that
20
   we've collected through discovery.
21
            THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Mr. Rich.
22
   Defendant raised the 101 issue. The Defendant moved under
23
   Rule 12 to dismiss Claim 109 of the '206 patent.
24
   Defendant never moved on any of the other claims at the
25
   motion to dismiss stage, and the Plaintiff -- excuse me,
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
the Defendant -- the Defendant never moved on any of the
other claims at the motion to dismiss stage, and the
Defendant never moved at the summary judgment stage on the
101 issue regarding any of these claims.
        I'm curious as to why we're now at trial with the
jury in the box, and this has not been raised at either the
summary judgment stage or the motion to dismiss stage.
        99 percent of the 101 challenges that I see come
to the Court for disposition either at the dismissal stage
or the summary judgment stage.
        I'm curious as to why Defendant felt it was in
their best interest to handle it without moving for a
decision by the Court at any of those two junctures.
        MR. RICH: Yes, Your Honor.
        We -- first off, we preserved the 101 defense as
to all claims. And the answer -- we've collected
additional evidence through discovery and thought that
should there be factual questions, it would be best
resolved through a bench trial, so that's why we're
bringing it now.
        And Your Honor's Packet Intelligence case, I
believe from 2017, presented a similar factual scenario
where the Defendant preserved the defense in its answer,
did not move at 12(b)(6) or the summary judgment stage, and
there was a subsequent bench trial.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: I think that one and this one are the only two times I've had that happen, so that's why I asked. Go ahead. Let me hear your argument. MR. RICH: All right. So we'll start with Claim 109 of the '206 patent. It recites two broad steps, classifying and scheduling. And with respect to the classifying step, it's classifying a plurality of packets according to end-user QoS requirements of the packets and scheduling the packets for the ultimate purpose of communicating the packets over a wired -- wireless bandwidth according to an undefined scheduling algorithm. I think the focus of this claim is the abstract idea of classifying information according to end-user service requirements and scheduling the information. And if Your Honor will turn to Slide 3, I'll briefly show you why this claim is abstract. There's an abstract category known as mental processes, and this claim reads right on a mental process and will practice it briefly. On the left side of the slide, you'll see a sticky note with end-user QoS requirements. QoS 5 and QoS 7 are the examples. And in the middle of the slide we see the claim language. And right under that, we see two packets and two groups, Packet 1 and Packet 2.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We can classify those packets according to their QoS requirements simply by drawing it on a piece of paper under the group for which the QoS corresponds to. That's the classifying step. Now, the scheduling step is just under that. we can practice that step by simply writing out a schedule, Packet 1, scheduled at Time 1. Packet 2, we'll schedule that at Time 2. So just by doing that, I think we've -we've practiced this claim in our minds. And I think that's a hallmark of abstract ideas. Now, turning to Slide 4, Your Honor, when the Court denied the original motion to dismiss, the Court cited to some statements in the patent that describe problems in wireless communications like high bit error rate, and the Court -- the Court found that the '206 patent solved those problems by classifying on a packet level what the ideal quality of service characteristics are for each type of data. Since then, we've taken the deposition of IV's expert, Dr. Williams, and I think that his deposition testimony tells us that this isn't involving a technological problem or technological solution, but he's

technological problem or technological solution, but he confirming that the underlying solution of Claim 109 is practiced outside the context of telecommunication networks.

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And we see here, we asked him about whether postal services would classify packets based on service requirements like priority overnight or ground, and then they get priority overnight mail out guicker? That's scheduling. And he said: Yes. And on the next slide we're -- we're illustrating this concept where we have two end-users, two postal customers on Slide 5, and we see that they have envelopes with different delivery requirements. Those are the end-user service requirements, overnight delivery and two-day transportation. And the postal workers -- workers will take those and classify them based on how fast those things need to go out. So that's the classifying and scheduling in the context of a postal system. So we think this is a fundamental concept that has long existed outside the context of telecommunication networks. And we've -- we've provided arguments on the dependent claims, and I can briefly spend about 30 seconds on each slide. Turning to Slide 6, we're addressing Claim 112. The claim limits the classifying and scheduling steps of Claim 109 to performance by a packet scheduler at a base

station or CPE station. 1 2 Now, what that's doing is simply limiting the claim to a technological environment, and the Federal 3 Circuit has told us that's not enough. That's the In re 4 TLI case. 5 Turning to Slide 7, Claim 118, communicating said 6 7 end-user QoS requirements. That amounts to sending information between generic points. 8 And, again, the Federal Circuit has said that sending and receiving information, regardless of the type 10 11 of information, is not even arguably inventive. And that's 12 the buySAFE case. 13 And briefly on Claim 140 on Slide 8, that claim recites coordinating and controlling access. They're very 14 15 similar steps to a wireless resource. Those steps are 16 functionally recited. They don't say how you coordinate or control access. 17 18 And, again, the Federal Circuit tells us when you have claims like that where it doesn't tell you how to do 19 20 it, that's not enough. 21 And then we see just below that the claim 22 receiving reservation request and sending grants, and 23 that's sending and receiving information, not enough at 24 Step 1. 25 THE COURT: What about the other dependent claims.

```
MR. RICH: Claim 144, Slide 9 recites ensuring
1
2
   high priority packets are provided appropriate bandwidth.
   And, again, that's a functionally recited claim. It
3
   recites a goal and doesn't tell you how to do it.
            And I can cite Your Honor to the Two-Way Media
5
   case from the Federal Circuit that involved a similar
6
   scenario where they found abstractness.
7
            THE COURT: I've got your briefing.
8
9
            MR. RICH: Okay. Lastly, Claim 146, it limits
   Claim 109 scheduling step to allocating in oversubscribed
10
11
   environments.
12
            Your Honor, that, again, is limiting a claim to a
   technological environment, and it's right there in the
13
   claim. It's not enough at Step 1.
14
15
            THE COURT: Let me hear about the '629 patent on
16
   this issue.
17
            MR. RICH: Yes, Your Honor. All right.
18
            So there's two challenged claims here, Claims 1
   and 4. We'll start by orienting you with Claim 1 on Slide
19
20
   12. Four -- four steps here. Applying a reservation
   algorithm, Step A on the slide. That's a generic step. It
21
22
   doesn't say how you do the reservation algorithm.
23
            Steps B and C can be talked about together.
24
   Reserving slots and future frames.
            And Step D, placing the packets in an isochronous
25
```

1 manner. 2 Now, that's -- the focus of this claim is making future reservations in a consistent time interval. 3 Now, turning to Slide 13, I'll briefly explain why 4 that's abstract. Again, this is just a mental process. We 5 see here it's analogous to a calendar. With the current --6 7 current week being the week of February 4th, the next week is starting February 10th. That's the future frame in the 8 claim. 10 Two weeks from now is the next -- Step C, two 11 future frames in the future. So this is a mental process 12 because let's say we need to schedule a meeting for the next three weeks. We do that today. And what I do is I 13 write my meeting there on February 12th, 19th, and 26th. 14 Those are the future reservations. 15 16 And, finally, turning to Slide 14, this is Dependent Claim 4, recites the reservation algorithm 17 18 determines whether said IP-flow is jitter-sensitive. 19 That does not alter the abstractness of Claim 1 20 but merely involves categorizing the IP-flow. It's 21 characterizing it as jitter-sensitive. And, again, that's 22 a quintessential abstract idea, according to the Federal 23 Circuit. 24 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Rich. Thank you for 25 your argument.

Let me hear a response from the Plaintiff. 1 MR. BLACK: Martin Black for Plaintiff. Thank 2 you, Your Honor. 3 Let me just address procedurally where I think we 4 We had a 12(b)(6) motion. Your Honor ruled on the 5 motion with respect to Claim 109 of the '206 patent, 6 7 concluding that it passed muster under Alice Step 1. Determining whether something is an abstract idea 8 or not is a question for the Court. They have not 9 identified any facts which would bear on that particular 10 11 question today. 12 We believe that Your Honor's ruling on that point should be law of the case, and that what we have just heard 13 is essentially an out of time motion for reconsideration. 14 If follows from the fact that Claim 109 meets 15 Step 1, that all dependent claims in the '206 patent also 16 17 meet Step 1. And it follows from that that there is 18 nothing to try on the '206 patent because we don't get to Step 2, and the more complicated question of how to handle 19 20 fact questions which arise at Step 2. 21 I will also note that the experts in this case did 22 not present the Defendants any 101 opinions. So they have 23 not asked for a jury instruction on 101. 24 The pre-trial order requests a bench trial, and 25 Mr. Kubehl called it an equitable issue. I don't know that

```
there's any support for that.
1
 2
            But the main point is with respect to Claim 109,
   the issue has been decided.
 3
            When we look at the '629 patent, it is similar to
 4
   the '206 patent. It adds several additional elements,
 5
   however, a reservation algorithm and the isochronous
 6
7
   treatment of packets, points which will be a matter of
   explanation and debate during the trial.
 8
            Plainly, the '629 patent resides in the very
   similar technological environment as the '206 and only
10
11
   extends and narrows and, more particularly, describes a
12
   feature of the inventions of Dr. Jorgenson.
            On that basis, we believe that neither of these
13
   claims -- independent claims or the dependent claims that
14
15
   depend upon them are abstract.
16
            All of these claims relate to the solutions to
   these particular technological problems and meet Alice
17
   Step 1.
18
19
            THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Black?
20
            MR. BLACK: No, Your Honor.
21
            THE COURT: Okay. Let me say this.
                                                  The Court is
22
   persuaded and has previously held that Claim 109 of the
23
    '206 patent is not directed to an abstract concept.
24
            The '206 patent and Claim 109, in particular, are
25
   tethered to technical problems related to data congestion
```

within wireless networks. 1 2 While the Defendants urge the Court to consider 10 -- Claim 109 to be analogous to a postal system, the 3 Court finds that wireless networks contain technological 4 problems not found in the brick and mortar world, such as high bit error rates and jitter which affect network 6 7 congestion behavior in a way that does not exist within the postal system. 8 Claim 109, through its use of end-user quality of service requirements to aid in scheduling packet 10 11 transmission, sets forth a solution that is rooted in 12 computer -- computer technology in order to overcome a 13 problem specifically arising in the realm of computer 14 networks and is not directed to an abstract idea, as 15 Defendants urge. 16 For these reasons, the Court -- for these very 17 same reasons, the Court finds that Claim 109 is not 18 abstract, and the Court also finds that the dependent claims that depend from Claim 109 are not abstract. 19 20 The Court is also persuaded that Claim 1 of the 21 '629 patent is not directed to an abstract concept. 22 '629 patent describes the same technical problems in the 23 art as the '206 patent. Claim 1 describes a technical solution to those 24

problems by introducing the reservation algorithm and

25

scheduler to provide an improved method of transmitting packets from various types of IP flows.

Accordingly, Claim 1 also sets forth a solution that is rooted in computer technology in order to overcome a problem specifically arising in the realm of computer networks, and the Court finds it's not directed to an abstract idea.

For the same reasons the Court finds that Claim 1 is not abstract, the Court also finds that the dependent claims from it -- that depend from it in the '629 patent are not abstract.

Consequently, the Court disposes of the 101 issue by finding that none of the asserted claims are abstract, and, consequently, there is no requirement or need to move to Step 2 of the Mayo/Alice analysis.

With that ruling, counsel, I also want to mention to you that in the last pre-trial hearing before the Court last week, there was a question from Defendants about the issue of claim preclusion.

The Defendants also assert that the Plaintiff's claims are barred by claim preclusion for accusing the same products of infringing a related patent to the patents asserted in this case but failing to assert these patents in the earlier Delaware litigation.

Let me be clear, the Court intends to rule on this

```
issue following the jury's verdict.
1
 2
            The parties should present any appropriate
 3
   evidence related to this matter during the course of the
   trial that will begin later today. And that way, the Court
 4
   will already have the benefit of such when the verdict is
 6
   returned and it then looks to and gives you a decision on
7
   the issue of claim preclusion.
            I think that's guidance as requested during the
8
9
   last pre-trial hearing.
            It is 12:30. I told the jury we would start back
10
11
   at 1:15. So with that, we will recess until 1:15.
12
            COURT SECURITY OFFICER: All rise.
13
            (Recess.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript from the stenographic notes of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter to the best of my ability. /S/ Shelly Holmes 2/4/19 SHELLY HOLMES, CSR, TCRR Date OFFICIAL REPORTER State of Texas No.: 7804 Expiration Date: 12/31/20